The
FORUM
For December, 1918

PRESIDENT WILSON AS A WORLD LEADER

An Appreciation and an Analysis of Our First International Leader

By HON. LEE SLATER OVERMAN
[U. S. SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA]

IN the past, America produced many world figures but no world leader in the political sense. This wasn't because many famous Americans were not capable of international leadership but because our relation to international affairs precluded the opportunity for exercising such leadership. Washington, the father of his country, of course belongs to and is honored as military genius and statesman by all the world, but he set the precedent for the political isolation by which until lately the exercise of American statesmanship was confined wholly to this hemisphere and largely to our own domain. Franklin and Jefferson and Hamilton, together with many other Americans, earned and exercised an intellectual leadership not circumscribed by geographical boundaries, but it was beyond and outside of the range of the workings of world politics. Lincoln, the American who is honored everywhere as the patron saint of human freedom, influenced world affairs by precept and example rather than by direct participation.

But the world war, into which we entered reluctantly because of attachment to our traditional policy of non-participation in Old World politics but in which we probably proved the deciding factor, after we could no longer, in honor, refrain from entering it, plunged us actively and positively into the maelstrom of international affairs. For the first time in our history it became possible, albeit necessary, for an American to exercise international leadership. How fortunate we were that the fates decreed that opportunity to, and imposed the duty upon, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States! Events of the past few weeks have justified his leadership and developments to follow, in my opinion, will give it political sanctity. It is not less fortunate that his leadership prevails in the readjustments incident to peace than that it predominated in the closing days of the war.

HOW THE PRESIDENT SHORTENED THE WAR

WHEN the unbiased historian of these times comes to weigh the causes leading to recent glorious developments, I verily believe he will give to Woodrow Wilson credit equal to that accorded Marshal Foch for bringing the war to a conclusion a year earlier than was expected by the best military experts. Foch undoubtedly exercised great military skill, but a power exceeding that of cannon was employed with great effect by our President. I believe that Wilson alone shortened the war at least a year, not solely by his vigorous promotion of our part of the fighting but by his splendid international diplomacy.

It was he who first gave clear and convincing voice to the purposes and intents of the nations at war with Germany. His enduring phrase, "We are fighting to make the world safe for democracy," stated the case for ourselves and the Allies better than all the learned volumes of explanation put forth since the war began. His "peace terms" constituted the first clear definition of the ends aimed at by the United States and its associates in the war. Just how far his words served to bring about in Germany and Austria

that disintegration which no doubt hastened the climax, because of the lack of detailed information, is not yet known.

However, I feel assured that the influence of his words in breaking down the morale of Germany and Austria was as potent in producing final victory as were our arms. Every leaflet containing his speeches dropped from aeroplane or balloon on enemy soil no doubt served our cause as well as a hundred cannon, and doubly well when backed up so ably by our and our allies' guns.

Unquestionably the Allies felt and were spurred on by the ideals for which they fought from the beginning. But those ideals were largely vague, intangible and elusive until we entered the struggle. Our isolation from the scenes and prizes of the great struggle relieved us of all suspicion and enabled us to say, through our leader, what our associates out of fear of misconstruction had hesitated to declare. For instance, President Wilson readily gave voice to the just aspiration of France to regain the territory wrested from it by Germany in 1870. France could only say it was fighting a defensive war for France out of fear that an announced intention to regain Alsace and Lorraine might give color to Germany's charge that she had entered upon a war of aggression. Likewise, President Wilson could speak as freely as he spoke clearly about the national rights of the smaller peoples held in subjection by the Central Powers, without danger of his words being construed as desire on our part for conquest.

THE PRESIDENT CRYSTALLIZED THE WORLD'S IDEALS

ONE of our great services to the Allies, upon our entering the war on their side, was in giving them an unimpeachable voice, and it is to our glory and their great advantage that the voice was exercised so capably by our President. It would not be fair perhaps to say that the ideals of the Allies were originated or heightened by us; but it is fair to say that the validity of those ideals were proven by our entering the war. And those ideals found crystallization in the words of Woodrow Wilson.

It may not be opportune or polite to draw comparisons between the leaders of the nations that were associated in the war against Germany. The world now no doubt does and the future I believe will recognize three men as the foremost civilian figures in the war. They are Lloyd George, Clémenceau and Woodrow Wilson. Discussion as to which, in inherent merit, is the greatest would not be timely now. However, circumstances if nothing more appear to have given Wilson dominant place in the triumvirate of present world leadership. Upon those three men who led civilization to victory in war rests the responsibility for leading it out of the difficulties and partial chaos incident to sudden peace. Each of them by temperament and talent possesses peculiar and superior qualities. Lloyd George, the born reformer, Clémenceau, the "tiger" radical, Wilson, the idealist and, as someone has said, "a conservative who doesn't stand still"—to what more capable trio could democracy entrust its cause?

George's passion for reform and Clémenceau's extremism will be tempered by Wilson's calm sanity, his all-pervading sympathy and his merciful magnanimity. The words of each bearing on reconstruction would seem, in their lack of rancor toward the people of enemy countries and their lofty expressions of hope and sympathy for those we have defeated in war, to have been torn from the pages of heroic poetry rather than from the feelings and passions of the time.

Time will probably show—as it proved Abraham Lincoln the best friend of the section of our country on which he made war—that the best friends of the peoples who populated the German and Austria-Hungarian empire are the three men who above all others will pass judgment upon them. And this, I believe, will be particularly true of Woodrow Wilson.

WILSON'S MERIT AS A WORLD LEADER PUT TO TEST

JUST as he made war for an ideal, he will so far as he may rebuild around an ideal. The case which he stated so well and effectively for the Allies remains yet to be proven

by the success attained in establishing the ideals upon which the case was based.

Therefore, Woodrow Wilson's greatest task is just at hand; the merit of his world leadership, heretofore necessary and unavoidable, will be put to the test. Now that the war is won and America's aid is no longer essential to success, will the Wilson idea prevail against the selfishness, hate, greed and desire for recrimination which are inescapable following experiences so cruel as those which the war lords of the Central Powers imposed upon humanity? Will he see that full justice is done but its bounds not overlapped? Will he be able to force conflicting interests and passions to recognize as the choice fruits of victory things far more important and desirable than indemnities secured and revenges accomplished? Can he prevent us and our associate nations from in some way catching the disease we have fought to destroy?

In those and other questions which might be asked lie problems far more difficult than was the making of successful war. But I believe that President Wilson's thought and voice will dominate in solving them.

For the very circumstances which placed him in the forefront in carrying on the war and defining its purposes will tend to make him arbiter in solving the questions arising out of the war.

The United States will spurn anything like European conquest or undue advantage as a result of the war as you would spurn the plague. We can go into the peace conference with clean hands and palms on which there will not be so much as the suggestion of an itch. There is nothing which we can ask for ourselves; thereby we shall be free to speak solely for the rights of others.

And who among living statesmen today can speak so well for others as Woodrow Wilson? Where is there a man imbued with a finer feeling for democracy, or possessing a saner conception of social justice? His forbearance with Mexico proved his patience as well as his deep sympathy for misused and abused masses. His tolerant attitude toward Russia, his perception of the ends aimed at, however blindly

and blunderingly, by an almost helpless people shows how his heart goes out to those only rudely, if at all, capable of taking care of themselves.

WILSON'S IDEALISM NOT IMPRACTICAL

YET the presence of American soldiers on Russian soil today is evidence of the fact that Wilson's idealism is not confounded by an impracticable nature. It proves that he has no more liking for the autocracy of Bolshevikism than for that of junkers; that he dislikes anarchy as much as he hates oppression.

He knows as well as the stubbornest reactionary that the world cannot be made over in a day, and that democracy, like all things worth while, has to grow—it cannot be manufactured. At best we can only fertilize the soil, sow the seed and protect the plant from the intruder. It is as important that the tendency toward extremism that is evident in most of overturned Europe be checked and restrained as that the evils from which it is the reaction be destroyed.

And there was never a wiser or more practical act of statesmanship than President Wilson's prompt offer of food to the starving peoples of the countries with which we were until lately actually and are still technically at war.

I don't know whether it shall be practicable or possible for the President to sit at the peace table. Really I think it of no great importance. Whether or not he is there in person, he shall be there in thought and determined will. I do not believe terms of peace which in essential character do not meet his approval will be adopted; and I am confident that the treaty finally agreed upon will bear the mark of his mind as indelibly as does our Declaration of Inedependence bear the stamp of Thomas Jefferson.

And his diplomacy in peace, like that he exercised in war, will be aimed at procuring rightful results rather than at establishing meaningless forms. His approach to European problems as so far disclosed indicates that he attaches more importance to the actual character than to the perfunctory skeleton of government. He knows that democracy

can exist even under a king, as in England, and that tyranny can walk hand in hand with democratic formula as has often happened in the republic south of us.

The dominant note he will sound at the peace conference will be in behalf of the submerged masses, for freedom and equal opportunity for all human beings.

Out of the war will come the reign of democracy throughout most of the world, and the era in world history thus begun will reflect the ideals of Woodrow Wilson, who takes his place in the annals of time as our first great international leader and one of the renowned world figures of all time.

THE SENTINELS

By MARGARET E. SANGSTER

DEAR God, you sent your angels long ago,
To sing a hymn above the weary earth—
You sent a star that silvered all the snow,
To tell the story of the Christ Child's birth;
And on this day we hear the song again,
And see the star reflected in the skies;
And through the midst of bitterness and pain
We see, once more, the Christ Child's smiling eyes.

Four years—and tho' the rows of crosses stand
Like sentinels that guard a sleeping throng
Above the slush and mud of No Man's Land;
And tho' our pilgrimage seemed dark and long—
With hearts all glorified we kneel and pray,
To thank you, God, for Peace on Earth today!

A DOUGHGIRL ON THE FIRING LINE

She Made the First Doughnut in France, and Was One of the First Four of Her Service to Go Over

By ADJUTANT HELEN PURVIANCE
[AMERICAN SALVATION ARMY WORKER IN FRANCE]

"If this is war, let it continue," said an American soldier as he partook of Miss Purviance's doughnuts. This Salvation Army lass tells of her experience of fifteen months in the service close to the great battle line in France.

WHEN a French soldier is wounded, and knows he is "going West," he asks for his wife, an Englishman calls for his sweetheart, but an American wants his mother. And the thought of that mother is carried with him like an indelible print from the training camps in America, across three thousand miles of water, and remains with him when he goes "over the top" and into that unknown country from which many never return.

I don't believe there are any big mothers in America, I mean big in statue, for every soldier speaks of her as "little mother."

"Say, when I get home——" Well, you just ought to hear some of the things these boys of ours tell me they are going to do when they get home. Some are going to sleep two weeks but most of them are going to eat. So I just want to warn you, you American mothers, stock the pantry right up to its top-most shelf with all the things he likes best because he has already decided what he wants for that first dinner at home.

Our organizations sent women workers to France that your boys may not miss you quite so much. We try to create a little of the home atmosphere and with a woman's hands help them over the rough spots of homesickness, wounds, or any of the other hurts that come to the fighting man. Our huts do not always look like a home. Sometimes it's a real, honest-to-goodness hut that can be taken to pieces and put

together again at a moment's notice. Another time it may be a tent, or a corner in some shell torn house.

The boys very rarely call us sister but very, very often you hear a twenty-seven year old girl addressed as "mother." If it wasn't for the beautiful tribute in that word, "mother," one would have to smile when it's used by a man old enough to be her father.

After I had been in Paris a few days, I went down to a camp of thirty-five thousand soldiers, where the Salvation Army has six huts, to learn something of housekeeping in a strange country under difficulties. The boys seemed glad to see American girls and many of them came over and bashfully shook hands with us. Some of them hadn't seen any girls from the States for months.

WHERE THE FIRST DOUGHNUTS WERE FRIED

FROM there our Col. Barker, of the S. A., took three other girls and myself out in a car to look for some troops who needed mothering. Our destination proved to be a big camp of the First Ammunition Train, which supplies ammunition to the First Division, America's famous shock troops. The boys absolutely refused to let us go, so Col. Barker left us with them. It was at this camp and on this division that the first American doughnut was given its try-out.

"What can we make to eat out of the things we have that will be American and taste good to the boys?" said one of the girls.

"A doughnut," promptly replied Margaret Sheldon, of Chicago, Ill., and a doughnut it was. We had no rolling pin, so the dough had to be patted into shape, and then came the question of how to cut it out. That problem was solved with the top of a baking-powder can and the hole, for whoever heard of a doughnut without a hole, was made with a camphor ice tube. I fried the first doughnut and saw it eaten by an American soldier. One of the boys remarked a short time after that as he was munching one of our doughnuts, "if this is war, let it continue."

When orders came for the men to move to the front, the Commanding Officer did not think we would be allowed to go, but just the same he supplied each of us with a helmet, two gas masks, and a shelter-half. (A shelter-half is part of a tent and the other half is carried by the fellow who shares the tent with you.)

UNDER BOCHE GUNS

IT was decided that we were to go to the front after all. On our arrival in the Toul Sector, the boys made dugouts for us, we opened our canteen, and everything was decidedly comfy considering we were in range of the enemy's guns. One of the boys gave me a dog, a French shepherd dog, whom we called "Sancey," and whenever the Boche planes began to bomb us that dog ran immediately to the dugout where she knew she would be fairly safe. But I can't say that the doughboys or doughgirls displayed quite so much common sense. Most of us ran out to see the planes, and on one occasion one of them flew so close to the ground that we could see the aviator. Several of the boys, and a couple of the girls, too, got rifles and shot at him. Of course this was very dangerous and strictly against regulations, for it only proved to the Boche, what he already suspected, that troops were billeted there.

It was at this time that the General in command of that division asked that all American women doing war work in France assist at the hospitals during a drive. I volunteered and was sent to a field hospital for gas and shell-shock men. I worked in the evacuation ward trying to make the men as comfortable as possible while awaiting their turn. We washed the blood from their faces, took away their handkerchiefs which were soaked with the gas, and gave them fresh pieces of gauze. For some we wrote letters, and if we had time washed their hands. We always made hot chocolate, soups, or cooling drinks for them. A doctor said to me, "If you women didn't do anything but walk through the wards so the boys could see you, and hear you talk, it would help." Another doctor told us that the hos-

pital attendants were more gentle with their patients because women were there.

THE SLEEPERS IN THE POPPY FIELDS

ONE afternoon I was feeling a bit " fed-up " with remaining indoors, so I left one girl in charge of the hut and suggested to the others that we take a walk. We felt that it was selfish to be merely taking a pleasure stroll, and decided to go up the hill and decorate the three American graves there. They were by a poppy field, and gathering great armfuls of these brilliant blooms, we made the resting place of those American boys a mass of pink and crimson flowers.

" Let's go down the other side of the hill to the hospital and leave the rest there," I said. " We have so many left." So we did and I hope they cheered up the sick boys.

Whenever we find an American grave (they are all marked), we take pictures of it, and if possible get the address of the relatives and write them, telling its location. It must be some comfort to those at home to know that *his* grave is being cared for by another American woman. The French people incidentally are very kind in this respect, and often the kiddies carry bouquets of flowers to put on freshly made graves of " Les Americains."

THE LURE OF THE KITCHEN

SOMEBODY once asked me how many batches of doughnuts we make in a day. I couldn't say, because we make one right after the other, as fast as we can. As soon as the boys find out we are making doughnuts they begin to line up, and as fast as they are cooked, they take them out of the pot with a twig.

Most of the work done by the ammunition boys must, of a necessity, be done at night, so I kept my hut open all night.

An officer said to me, " Adjutant Purviance, since your hut has been open at night I find my men have fewer accidents and less repairing to do. They don't want to miss that piece of pie and cup of hot chocolate."

We hadn't had any mail for almost a month and the boys were "pretty low," as they expressed it. They hung around the kitchen more than ever. Some of them scraped pans and washed mugs because they wanted a chance to talk to us. It was very hard to get flour at that time, the transportation facilities being especially bad, and one day one of the boys came in the kitchen and said, "I know why you can't get any flour." Of course we all asked, "Why?"

"Because," he said with a grin, "they are making so many doughboys now."

While I was running two huts about a kilometer and a half apart, I started out for the other one late one evening. About half way there I met the girl I had left in charge marching along at the head of a whole company of soldiers. In answer to my question she replied, "the Captain said we could entertain these boys for the evening." So back to the hut we went and I gave the top sergeants fifteen minutes to select the best talent in the lot. They sang, gave recitations, danced and told funny stories. They all like to sing, also to play games; blind man's bluff, drop the handkerchief, and romping games that go back to the days of their childhood parties.

THE FIGHT ON THE SOISSONS FRONT

WE arrived at the Soissons front about nine o'clock one night and the billeting officer assigned us to quarters for the night. We always carry blankets, cots, and sometimes mattresses. When we got to the house assigned to us, or rather what was left of the house, we found it already occupied, so back we went. We didn't want to look for another place because we knew all the corners would be harboring sleeping soldiers. So we just sat and waited for our friend the billeting officer. He didn't get back until 4 o'clock, so we decided to sleep some other time and began to make out doughnuts, pies, and hot chocolate for the coming day. Everyone had left the village but two old ladies, who had positively refused to go, and they still pottered around in

their garden perfectly indifferent to the shells the Boche sent over at frequent intervals.

The next night we made our beds in an ammunition truck. You have never seen anything so beautifully kept as the engines in those trucks and the boys are justly proud of them. During the Cantigny drive our General sent a message to the front asking if the line was still holding and the answer came back, " it will hold as long as you continue to keep us supplied with ammunition."

Our boys are such splendid fighters! When they start after the Hun nothing stops them, not even their own barrage. Many of them have been wounded simply because they wouldn't stop, and went right through our own artillery fire, but as the boys all say they want to " see those Germans pushing up the daisies."

I heard a captured German General say, " your men are wonderful fighters. You have organized and trained an army in a few months that would have taken us five years."

Our boys told me they had captured machine gun nests where German women had been strapped to the guns just as the men were. In fact not far from us there was a woman among the prisoners.

Putting women in the trenches, and sawdust in their bread, were some of the other things Germany had to resort to before the end. I happened to find some of their bread and saw the sawdust but I wanted to be sure, so one of the doctors examined it too. A German prisoner stood and watched us, then said, " the Kaiser baked that bread."

My brother, who is working with the ambulance service, was carrying the wounded out of a town I watched being shelled. It was filled with civilians and among those hurt was a small boy of about eight or nine. Just before my brother left me I gave him a flower, so he gave it to the little fellow.

" He didn't groan once," he told me afterwards, " and nearly one whole side of his face was shot away. I put him in my ambulance and took him to the nearest hospital but

when I got there he was dead. Closely pressed to his baby face was the crushed flower."

One of the hardest things I ever had to do was to tell a boy of his mother's death. His captain came to me with two letters, one written to him by the boy's sister and the other for the boy.

"Look here, you're a woman and can do this better than I can," he said, putting the two letters in my hand. Then he sent the boy to me. He was just a youngster, only seventeen years old. When I finished talking with him, he said, "I guess my sister thinks I don't care what happens now, but she's wrong. I'm going to live a clean, straight life so I'll be able to meet my mother when it's all over."

FOR THE DAYS OF WAITING

I HAVE a message to you mothers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts of America, a message from your boys in khaki. I am trying to tell you what it means to those boys to have some of their womenkind with them in France, and how much more it's going to mean to them now that the fighting has stopped. Those fighters of ours whom we affectionately call "our boys," but whom the Germans speak of as "men," will need us much more now. America can't send too many of her best men and women to help the man in khaki through that tiresome period of waiting to come home.

I have been in the Salvation Army for ten years, serving mankind. I have been within sound of the guns for fifteen months, and twice, during the whole time, I was, I must admit, what is so expressively called, "scared to death." A bomb did it once and a shell the other time. When the bomb fell I was out in the vegetable garden with some other girls and several soldiers. Somebody yelled and automatically everybody threw themselves flat on the ground. The bomb hit near us and made a hole large enough to put a small size house in. The other time I was standing in the little curtained off part of the tent we used for our sleeping quarters, when I heard the swish of a shell. I knew it

wasn't from our guns because there was no report. So I faced about with the vague idea of dodging it. It landed all right but fortunately for me it was a dud and didn't explode, or I wouldn't be here now.

When we got ready to move to the Verdun front, the Colonel said no women could go.

"Oh, Colonel, you don't mean that," said one of our girls. "You can't expect us to stay here when our boys are going?"

"You can't go," he repeated, "you will be killed."

"Please don't say we can't go, Colonel. We can't leave our boys but we can die with them."

Eighty per cent of the S. A. workers in France are women, and I am glad I was permitted to be one of the first four that went to the front. I have been on six different battle fronts. When I first went to Toul I saw Mont Sec and was there again in time to see it captured.

I have a letter from Colonel Lawton which will give you some idea of what our work means to the boys. I am very proud of this letter which is written in his own hand.

"SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE."
JUNE 25th, 1918.

Adjutant Helen Purviance,
Salvation Army.

MY DEAR MISS PURVIANCE:

I have been informed that there is a probability of your leaving the Sector occupied by our Division and I feel that I would be lacking in my duty as an officer if I did not make an effort to express to you my sincere gratitude for, and in appreciation of, your work while with us.

You have labored early and late through all conditions of weather and hardships to brighten the lot of the American soldier at the front. No privation, exposure, or danger has been too great for you to stand as long as you were able to feel that your efforts contributed in the slightest degree to the comfort of others.

I can assure you that your work has made the organization that you represent welcome in any camp or station of

the army and you may rest assured that you will always carry with you the gratitude of those for whom you have done so much.

On the behalf of my officers and men I wish you God-speed and only good luck and happiness which you so richly deserve.

Truly your friend,

F. G. LAWTON,

Colonel U. S. A. Commanding First Division Trains.

AND THE DAWN CAME

By LEONIE DAVIS COLLISTER

ALL night I listened for your step in vain—
I only heard the wind crash through the rain,
And as a mourner guards his precious dead,
I guarded in my heart each word you'd said,
And wept in wonder that life had been so sweet;
And then the dawn came palely down the street.

THE PERILS OF SECRET TREATY MAKING

How Conspiring Diplomacy and Public Ignorance Produce War

By HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH
[U. S. SENATOR FROM IDAHO]

ASSUMING that the President's personal appearance at Versailles will establish the safety of world democracy, the triumph will be the destruction of a menace far greater than actual war, the destruction of secret diplomacy.

There is a story associated with the treaty of 1871 between France and Germany which throws much light upon the methods of secret displomacy. France was anxious to secure a retrocession of Belfort, an Alsatian fortress. One of the French plenipotentiaries was a shrewd, persevering man of business, a student of human nature, by the name of Pouyer-Quertier. The representatives of the great Powers had sat late into the night. Bismarck finally announced that he was desirous of retiring and made ready to go. But Pouyer-Quertier insisted upon another bottle of wine, and Bismarck finally yielded. Before the bottle was finished Belfort had been receded to France.

For nearly three centuries in secret chambers, in the midst of conviviality and for reasons wholly disassociated with the interest or welfare of the people concerned, peoples and nations have been handed about. Will the world in the face of this awful catastrophe ever again permit the interests and relations of nations to be determined without full knowledge to those who must meet with all they have the crisis when it comes?

It is not very material to a people to have the publication of a treaty if its entire negotiation has been carried on in

secrecy up to the point where they are bound by it as a nation. If the Powers operating in secrecy proceed to the point where the treaty has become valid and binding, there is not much consolation to the people in knowing what it is after it has reached the point where their mouths are closed and they are stopped as a practical matter from any proceeding whatever. Therefore, to begin with, we must open discussion of the treaties before they are concluded and before they become binding upon the nations which are interested in the particular treaties.

EVILS OF PUBLICITY LESS THAN THOSE OF SECRECY

I WOULD be perfectly willing to concede that there may be some steps in the negotiations between the negotiating parties which at times ought to be treated in secret; but the secrecy never should extend to the point where the policy of a nation may be determined prior to open, full discussion and consideration upon the part of the treaty-making power. A treaty which establishes the policy or political course of a people ought to be open in its consideration from the very beginning. While evils may be conjured up in fancy with reference to the open consideration of the negotiation in some stages of it, those evils, in my judgment, are infinitely less than the evils which flow from secrecy. In weighing one against the other I have no difficulty myself in arriving at the conclusion that open diplomacy with reference to all matters which result in a final treaty or the shaping of a policy for people is the only proper procedure in this day and age of the world to establish the relationship of nations.

The President, in his address to Congress on January 8, 1918, said that the first item of the only possible program of the world's peace was:

> Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

There is no limitation upon that, as to open negotiation, consideration, or discussion. In view of the fact that it is a

statement made by that part of the Government which would be more likely than the Senate of the United States to be called upon to act in secrecy in the origin of the proceedings, I take it that we can accept the President's view as to what constitutes open diplomacy, but this is not a new subject. It is one about which men have been thinking and writing, and upon which much has been said during the last 10 years. Many of the statements with reference to the evils of secret diplomacy come from those who have had much to do with the subject and who have given a vast amount of study to the subject at close range.

The London *Daily News,* in an editorial shortly before the commencement of the war, said:

> Can Europe ever again tolerate the appalling peril of secret diplomacy? It belongs to the traditions of autocratic and personal government; it has no place in a democratic world.

That was a statement made before the most pronounced evil of secret diplomacy with which the world is familiar had been exposed to men, to wit, the present war. I do not contend, as has been often stated by men more familiar with the subject that I, that every war in Europe for the last hundred years can be traced to the evil consequences of secret diplomacy. But I do say, without hesitancy, that every war in Europe for the last hundred years has had, as a contributing and impelling cause, the evils of secret diplomacy. It has entered into every conflict and has tended to bring about every war in which Europe has been engaged even as far back as the treaty of Westphalia. Whether or not one could sustain the position that it has been the moving cause or the sole cause is not necessary for us here to discuss, but very few students of the subject will deny that it has been a powerfully contributing cause to these many conflicts. I think furthermore, no man can study the history of the present war, its origin and cause, without coming to the conclusion that it had its origin almost wholly and exclusively in secret diplomacy.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE THE VICTIMS OF SECRET DIPLOMACY AND MISREPRESENTATION

HAD the consideration of these questions, even after the ultimatum to Serbia, been conducted in the open, before the entire world, with the sunlight of publicity beating in upon those people who were fomenting war and speculating in the lives of nations, the war would, I believe, have been averted. When we now reflect upon the visit of Lord Haldane to Germany, for instance, prior to the beginning of this war, and the action upon the part of the representatives of the several Governments, the dishonest, sinister, scheming of the dynasty of Germany playing under cover of secrecy, one can but conclude that this hellish conflict could have its birth nowhere outside of secrecy and darkness; the open light of day would have exposed it to premature death—secrecy is always the handmaiden of crime.

We have been loath to believe, as a people, that the mass of the German people would, had they known all and been free to act, have sanctioned the war. I do not mean a popular vote—I mean that if they could have known what was going on in secret with a view of bringing on the war.

There was a powerful propaganda put forth in Germany immediately following the declaration of war to convince the mass of the German people that war had been forced upon Germany. That propaganda was essential to secure from the German people the support that was necessary and essential to carry on the war. They were made to believe that every effort on the part of the Hohenzollerns or the dynasty, had been made to preserve peace. They knew nothing about the facts. It was all a matter of secrecy, confined to the chambers where the chancellors sit.

Had the German people been permitted to know the facts as they existed, had they been familiar with the scheme which was being carried out by their rulers and been permitted to judge of the facts as they developed from day to day it would have been a powerful factor against war even in Germany.

This war did not have its origin among the people of any country. There was no passion coming up from the great mass of those who fought and died in this war demanding the war. There was no familiarity with facts which enabled them even to have an opinion upon the matter. They moved up to the slaughter pen as thoroughly dumb driven by the secret diplomatic powers of certain European governments as the dumb brute goes to the shambles. There was not a note in Europe among the masses of the people anywhere favoring war. There was not a discordant passion among those now in battle line in Europe anywhere for this war. Those upon whom the burden falls entertained no enmity toward those whom they were slaughtering.

They were brought to the clash by the power which has been permitted for 300 years to carry on its schemes and its ambitions behind closed doors and to tie its peoples by obligations and schemes with which the people had nothing to do. The greatest war of all history was begun not to preserve liberty, but to destroy it, and the scheme was hatched in the chancellories of Europe. While these secret agents schemed the people toiled on in fancied security, without hatred or passion, until the secret conspiracy turned loose its dogs of war " in obedience to a barren diplomatic formula."

There has not been announced in this great controversy a proposition which goes more thoroughly to the heart of the controversy than the proposition which the President announced, that a prerequisite to any permanent peace is that hereafter no such thing shall happen; that hereafter the people shall be consulted; and the only way in which they can be consulted is by their knowing the different steps which their representatives take from day to day and month to month and year to year in their relations with other nations. Without realizing this as one of the fruits of the war, we can never enjoy real security.

WHY THE PEOPLE HAD TO BE EDUCATED TO THE WAR

WHEN this war began, in England the first six months of the war was devoted almost exclusively to arousing the English people to the real situation. They had to be

advised of things they were entitled to know long before. Almost every conceivable method of propaganda was adopted in order to bring the morale and the spirit of the English people up to the point of co-operation and solidarity in the support of the war. If they are permitted to be familiar with their relationship to other governments, they are prepared at all times either to approve or to disapprove of the conduct of their Government. In no instance in this conflict were the people themselves informed as to the nature of the controversy or as to the reasons why they should be called into such a conflict; and every single nation which entered into the war had to indulge in the same propaganda to familiarize its people with that with which they should have been familiar from the beginning, not only giving them the power to stay the proceeding of the conflict, if it was unjust and unrighteous, but to support it in case it was just and righteous, and to support it with vigor and with efficiency from the hour that the conflict arose.

I can conceive of no matter of more importance to the people with which they should be more familiar, than that of their relationship to the other nations. In this country we submit almost every conceivable complex question to the masses of the people, and they act upon it either direct or through their representatives. Almost every conceivable problem goes to them in some way through their elections—questions which are more complicated, more complex, and more difficult of solution than most international questions, and yet not so much depends upon their solution. The very life of the Nation, all their energy, their means, material and otherwise, are at the call of the Nation when the hour comes; and if there is any one question with which they should be familiar it is that which involves all they have. Domestic questions affect them seriously enough, but only proportionately to the seriousness of their relationship to other nations.

Up to the time that the President delivered his address and revealed the facts upon which we were compelled to act—the real reasons for going to war were not known to the people. The American people are perfectly capable of

forming sound and intelligent conclusions on these questions, and, be assured, American honor will not suffer at their hands. When war came both to Germany and to England and to this country these matters which might have been divulged and made known to them—the entente relationship, the treaties or understanding which bound those nations together, the obligation of one to another—had been in existence for years, and the people knew nothing whatever about them. They knew nothing about their relationship one to another, and had never been consulted with reference to those things for which they offered up their lives. These treaties are entered into contrary to the interests of the people, without the people being given any opportunity at all to pass upon them.

The propaganda for open diplomacy in Europe is widespread and seems to extend to every country of Europe. The people are determined that they will never enter another war, if they can have their way about it, which they have not themselves had anything to do with originating, and with which they were not in sympathy when it started, simply to carry out the agreement which had been made in secret by their representatives. In my humble judgment that applies also to the mass of the German people.

We were in this war by reason of the fact that the German dynasty was able to make these secret arrangements and keep them from their own people.

LUST OF POWER, SECRETLY SCHEMED, CAUSED THE WAR

EVER since the close of the Turco-Prussian war the scheme has been going forward which finally resulted in this war, and back of it were the ambitions and the lust for power. But this found its expression and its final achievement through the methods to which I have referred, the secret machinations and understandings and arrangements which they had been hatching and making throughout Europe.

Although at this time no one likes to remember it, every one would have liked to have kept out of this war if we

could have done so with honor. That was the attitude of the American mind; that was the attitude of the American public; it was the attitude of the American Congress, and it was the attitude undoubtedly of the American President. When the time came which compelled a reversal of that policy it was a very short period from that time until we declared war, and in that respect I maintain, as I have said, the people were not sufficiently informed as to the necessity for the declaration of war until they got it from the President and Congress. It came almost contemporaneously with the declaration itself.

But you might just as well argue in favor of a secret declaration of war as to argue in favor of a secret consideration of a treaty which may result in war. In the debate which took place in the English Parliament a short time ago I read a paragraph from Mr. Trevelyan, who said:

At the same time the House of Commons has shown an appreciation that there is a new era approaching and that the men and women of this country are going to take a more active and critical part in politics. * * * I am firmly convinced that during this war among many changes of opinion that have occurred there is, perhaps, no change of opinion so decisive as this, that our people now feel that self-government and democracy are unreal boasts, are empty phrases, if they are not applied with the same completeness to foreign policy as they are, and have been, to home policy.

There, in my judgment, is a succinct statement of the entire controversy. There can be no such thing as a democracy in the true sense of the word, as a rule of the people in my proper sense of the phrase if the matters which involve their foreign relationships are not as clearly understood and debated and considered by them as are the matters which deal with their domestic affairs. The matters which enter more directly into their very lives are the matters which are withheld from them; the matters concerning which they could endure secrecy are submitted to them.

NO SUCH THING AS DEMOCRACY WITH SECRET FOREIGN DIPLOMACY

SHALL the Senate of the United States put its seal of approval upon such transaction by saying that we, too, will bind our people if it is within our power to do it, and notify them after the contract has been made? As this member of Parliament very well says, there is no such thing as democracy; it is a false phrase, unless the people are permitted to pass upon that for which they may be called upon to suffer and to die. He continues:

For 18 months they refused to give the House of Commons any information. At the conclusion of that time the arrangement was revealed to the world by the then Russian premier. Shortly afterwards occurred the Russian revolution. It then became apparent that the Russian people did not approve of the policy at all, but that it had been done in their name by the unscrupulous ministers who surrounded the Czar during his regime. I do not know why that arrangement with Russia about Constantinople should have been concealed from this house and the country for any reason except fear of their disapproval, and I am personally convinced—I may be wrong—that if there had been a foreign affairs committee, before whom the principal acts of policy had to be placed before they were realized, that agreement, in fact, would never have been arrived at with Russia.

So we see that the discussion is going on elsewhere; the movement is going forward in other countries, and we are simply keeping pace by our declaration in regard to this with that movement, which is world-wide. Its evils are upon every hand.

There was not a boy leaving his country home under the American flag who went forward to offer all he had upon the battle fields of Europe who was not to a very great extent a victim of secret diplomacy.

The conspiring ministers of Europe brought about a condition of affairs which compelled the United States to fight or give up its liberty, because the scheme behind closed doors was to destroy human liberty.

There may be "delicate questions" in Europe in connection with which secrecy should prevail. I am rather inclined to think that in the European chancelleries, where so many treaties were made for purely personal reasons or because of personal ambitions and at the instigation of a class of people who are sometimes interested, but that might be true; but I am thinking with reference to treaties which shall be made by this Republic.

NO TREATY TOO "DELICATE" TO GIVE TO THE PEOPLE

AS to them, there can be no "delicate questions" as it occurs to me.

I can not think now of any question that has arisen with reference to any treaty of this country since the beginning of the Government which could be really considered a question which the people ought not to know about. These "delicate questions" are rather indelicate suggestions to the effect that foreign affairs are too high up in the scale of intelligent effort for the consideration of the people. All public questions were once too delicate for the people, and in some countries of Europe, particularly in Germany.

What question has arisen with reference to any treaty in which the United States has been interested since the Jay treaty up to the present time that it would not have been well for the people of all Europe to have known about? Look back over the history of our treaties, their negotiation, their terms, and what finally became of them, and what question has arisen with reference to these treaties in the last hundred and odd years which the whole world could not have known about and been better off if they had known about it, and what question has arisen upon which the American people could not have passed with intelligence?

This conflict has closed. A scourged and weary people begin to assume again the avocations and duties of peace, and some of the most vital of human problems come up for consideration—problems whose solution will take form in treaties to be ratified. There is first the peace treaty, upon

which we are to build our hopes for permanent security, for a durable peace. It will have to do with our welfare and happiness as a people, our life as a Nation for years and perhaps for centuries. Certainly no one will contend that that treaty or any part of the negotiations should be considered in secret. Certainly no one will contend that those who have fought the fight and made the sacrifice, who in future years are to bend under the fearful debt the war has imposed, and finally through their energy and deprivations pay it, will not be entitled to know every step from the first to the consummation. Certainly no man will stand in the Senate and invoke secrecy upon that scene made possible by the blood and the offerings of the people. Certainly no one will contend that there are " delicate matters " here, too delicate for the inspection and approval or disapproval of those who are to make the treaty possible.

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY MUST NOT BE CHANGED BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

ALONG with the treaty of peace will come other propositions, propositions which will reach down and take hold upon the very foundations of our national being and, if certain courses are adopted, may change the whole drift of our national life. We will likely be called upon then as a people, as a Nation, to pass upon the question of whether we will depart from the advice of the Father of his Country to enter into no permanent alliance with European powers or whether we shall hold fast to the faith which has guided us through the first century. I am not going to discuss the merits of this question. My views for what they are worth are known, and the vicissitudes of war have not changed them. But certainly that policy which bears the stamp of approval of Washington and Jefferson, which enabled us to steer through the unexplored sea upon which we launched our frail bark in 1789, and without which, in my judgment, the story of this Republic would have been a short-lived one, will not be changed behind closed doors. Whether we shall abandon the policy or hold to it is a subject upon which honest and

patriotic men may differ, but any man who would advocate its change without the full and complete knowledge and approval of the American people would have no claim to the respect and confidence of those who love free governments. Not one step should be taken, not the slightest obligation binding as to such a course should be had without the full knowledge and the unqualified approval of the people whose government this is. That which uproots the sacred traditions of a people should be approved alone by the people. No closed doors on that transaction.

Another phase of the same subject is presented in the proposition of a league to enforce peace—a league which it is hoped all nations will join. Neither do I discuss the merits of this proposition at this time.

I only point out its tremendous import, its almost stupendous possibilities for change in our national life. Some think it would make for peace, some think it would turn this Republic into an armed camp. It seems to me clear enough the changes wrought by such a course will be such as to make us a different political structure. We will necessarily take upon ourselves the race questions, the political jealousies, the troubles of tortured Europe. Some think we would be able to compose them and make for permanent peace. Others think, and with them stands the judgment of the fathers, that it would only draw us into the maelstrom of European politics. Only experience can fathom the troubled waters of that boundless sea. Will this, too, be considered in secret? Will alliances and treaties be made and confirmed for such a momentous course in secret? Will those matters upon which hang the happiness of the living and the countless generations to come be disposed of as "delicate problems"—too delicate for the people to understand or to pass upon, but not too delicate, perchance, to require limb and life in their support?

People who suffer and die as our people have done in the great cause of civilization can be trusted in every hour of every emergency which is to mark, as we hope, the onward progress of this Republic.

THEY SHALL PAY

By MARTHA B. THOMAS

PAY for the blood you have spilled in Picardy!
Pay for despair, and the tears of the old!
Pay for the terror of children in darkness!—
Buy desolation with silver and gold!

Pay for the eyes you have plunged into midnight!
Pay for the bodies you've shattered so well!
Pay for the laughter you've turned into screaming!—
What is your market of values in Hell?

Pay for the heartache that runs like a river,
Circling the sorrowing mothers of men!
Pay for the prayers of love and of longing!—
Here is a bill that will stagger you then;

You cannot pay, but your children's sad children,
Bearing the sting of your country and name,
They shall be bent with your debts of dishonor;
They shall be bowed with your burdens of shame.

Through their despair shall be paid the last farthing;
Through their distress shall be canceled each debt;
Yea, in their dreams will your Nemesis follow,
What you have done they will never forget.

YOUR RIGHT TO SPEAK FREELY

A Discussion of the Fundamental Rights of Loyal Americans

BY HON. MILES POINDEXTER
[U. S. SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON]

ALMOST unfortunate condition with reference to the freedom of public expression, and particularly that of the press, has been developed by the war. A widespread misunderstanding seems to have taken a deep hold upon the country.

It occurs primarily out of two things—first, the legislation against seditious and disloyal utterances and propaganda; and, second, the taking over by the several governmental agencies of the collection and distribution of information.

Incidental to these main factors are a number of measures also affecting the people's sources of information, and the means of developing a virile and independent public opinion. The increase of second-class postal rates upon newspapers and magazines and the establishment of the so-called zone system therein has worked a great injustice upon many sections of the country, particularly those remote from publishing centers. The success of any democratic government depends more upon an enlightened and well-informed public opinion than anything else.

A wise public policy should encourage and promote in every way possible the free circulation of all useful literature. The increase of postal rates and establishment of the zone system has crippled the circulation of many papers and magazines, and added extra burdens upon the people in securing necessary reading matter. The excuse for this made by the Post Office Department has been that the cost of the distribution of this matter in the mails was greater than

the receipts. When one compares the rates and conditions in such countries as Canada with our own, it is difficult to accept the figures put out by the Post Office Department. Irrefutable showing as to inaccuracy and exaggeration of statements as to this cost have been made, but aside from all that the papers and magazines of the country are perhaps as great an educational factor as the schools of the country. Upon the latter we spend something like six hundred million dollars a year; so even if the distribution of papers and magazines costs the Government more than the postal receipts were under the former rates, it would still be good policy to encourage and facilitate this distribution even at that extra expense. The Democratic Administration's policy in this regard is opposed to the fundamental principles of uniformity of rates of public service to all regardless of locality and to that wise policy of government aid and encouragement of learning so essential to a free government.

USE AND ABUSES OF PROPAGANDA

IN the eagerness with which the people and Congress have come to the support of the Government in the war with a grant of practically every request made by those responsible for its conduct, enormous appropriations of money out of the public Treasury have been turned over to the Administration for war propaganda and censorship. This has been developed far beyond the anticipation of Congress. In the brief space of this article, I cannot even enumerate the nature of the abuses, to say nothing of the specific instances, which might be tabulated, of the perversion of this power for partisan or other improper purposes. The theatres have been utilized. On going one evening to a moving picture exhibition I listened to a four-minute speaker, operating at the expense of the Committee on Public Information presumably to aid in the sale of Liberty Bonds, a good portion of whose speech was taken up with a fulsome eulogy of the Democratic President. It would be interesting to have figures as to what percentage of the printed matter put out by this committee is devoted to fulsome praise of the ac-

complishment of the Administration, rather than to a statement of fact. The suppression of the truth rather than the truth itself has often been the obvious purpose in view in this propaganda. This was notoriously exemplified in the defense of the Administration in its ordnance and aeroplane failures. The sordidness of this sort of use of funds lavishly supplied in the great burst of patriotism of our people does not need to be elaborated upon.

The legislation enacted by Congress to punish and prevent, if possible, the support of the enemy by written or spoken words was just and necessary. When the country is engaged in a struggle for its existence, as the United States is at present, no man under its jurisdiction should be allowed to aid the enemy by espousing his cause. In my opinion the penalty for such disloyalty and treason cannot be made too severe. I am in entire accord with the laws on this subject, and wrote myself that section which penalizes the support of the German cause or opposition to the cause of the United States.

Unfortunately, however, partly through a misunderstanding of the law, partly through an excess of zeal for the country's cause, there has been promulgated an idea that it is disloyal and unlawful to criticize public officials, and especially the President. It is astonishing to what extent even the editors of great newspapers have either been deceived or intimidated by this idea. It has been promoted in large degree by the propaganda and arguments of the Committee on Public Information and by the action in certain cases of the Post Office Department or postmasters, as in the case of the seizure of the Metropolitan magazine by the New York Postmaster.

PUBLIC OPINION, THE GOVERNING FORCE OF A FREE COUNTRY

IT may be well to take advantage of this opportunity to state what the law is on the subject; and what it seems should be the rule of propriety. Instead of it being unlawful to criticize public officials at this time there never was a time

when it was more essential, if our Government is to accomplish what is expected of it, that there should be free and independent expression in regard to the conduct of public officials. The force of public opinion, which operates solely through its expression in speeches and on the printed page, is the governing force in every free country. It is the great dynamo which drives the machinery of State. It is absolutely essential to the proper conduct of affairs. Without it, selfishness, dishonesty, and incompetence would flourish in office, and disaster would soon follow. If the free operation of public opinion is essential in time of peace, it is more essential in time of war, because of the more vital character of the issues involved. When the Government, either through a postmaster, its Committee on Public Information, with its ramification of agencies and activities, or through any other activity, inculcates the idea that public officials, including the President himself, should not be criticised and that all loyal citizens will support these officials in every policy which they espouse and in every act which they commit—it is reaching a heresy which in itself is disloyal and of the utmost danger. Furthermore, it is untrue. Every man has a perfect legal right now, as at all other times, to speak and write freely about public officials, either in support or condemnation, and this applies to the President as well as everybody else. He and all other public officials are subject to trial and judgment at the bar of public opinion, which cannot operate except through its means of expression. Even in times of peace it is unlawful to publish or speak malicious falsehoods to the damage of either a private citizen or public official. So far from a public official being exempt from criticism, the common law recognizes and tolerates a greater freedom of expression and of criticism of public officials than of private individuals, recognizing it as an agency of government, and due allowance is often made by the courts, in the trial of libel suits, for the extraordinary latitude of criticism to which public officials are subject.

NOT DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE DISLOYALTY AND SEDITION

THE same rule exists now as heretofore. It is unlawful to publish disloyal or seditious matters. What is disloyal and seditious is not difficult to determine, and, of course, no loyal citizen desires to publish any such matter and all are interested in preventing such publication. It is unlawful to publish false and malicious statements in regard to public officials, but it always has been so, and there is no new rule or law in that regard. With these limitations it is perfectly lawful and permissible to discuss freely and comment upon or criticize the acts of all public officials; in fact, the highest loyalty and patriotism might require not only the criticism, but the denunciation of public officials. Sometime ago the name of a Colonel in the Army was sent to the Senate for confirmation for Brigadier General. I was advised of certain disloyal utterances which this Colonel had spoken in various parts of the country. Under the circumstances it was not disloyal or improper to criticize this officer for his conduct, but on the contrary in my judgment loyalty required everyone aware of what he had said to criticise and denounce him and to give publicity to his conduct in this regard. I did so, and after considerable trouble prevented him from being promoted to Brigadier General, but was somewhat surprised a little later to find that the Secretary of War had put him in charge of the War Intelligence Office at Chicago. In France, it has been proved in trials in the courts that high public officials were carrying on treasonable negotiations with Germany. Could it be said that it was disloyal for a patriotic Frenchman to criticise these traitors in office? While we have had but few, and those inconspicuous instances, of that kind in the United States since the days of Aaron Burr, it still serves to point the principle we are discussing. It is of the very essence of the proper conduct of the war that stupidity, incompetence, luke-warmness, indolence, or disloyalty in office should be pointed out, criticized, exposed, and denounced wherever it exists. Now, as heretofore, newspapers and individuals are responsible to the law and to public

opinion for the soundness, truth, and loyalty of their expressions. There is no other limitation.

THE PUBLIC HAS THE RIGHT OF DISCRIMINATION

A FEW days ago a United States Senator declared that it was the duty of the people to support the President "in every particular"; and on the next day another Democratic Senator went still further and declared in a resolution, which he introduced, not that we should support the President in all of his known policies and acts, but that we should pledge ourselves to support him in unknown and undisclosed actions "in whatever course he may pursue" in the future. It probably would not be difficult to discover a motive for this position in these particular cases, but the idea that Congress or the people generally should so blind themselves, surrender all right of judgment or discrimination, will find little acceptance; in fact, the first of these utterances had particular reference to the President's negotiations of the 8th of October with Germany as to terms of peace. The deluge of criticism, protest, and denunciation, which swept over the country, showed that the public did not share the views of the Senator referred to. It is very likely that this overwhelming expression of public opinion against the negotiations which the President had begun with the German government caused the President in his note of October 14th to break off the negotiations. Apparently he felt some resentment against the criticism to which he had been subjected, as on the same day he issued a statement to the public, over his signature, asking them to subscribe for bonds, but "to leave to the governments of the United States and of the Allies the momentous discussions initiated by Germany."

The incident and the result, however, both serve to emphasize the right and value of independent public criticism of a high official.

All of this, however, is subject to rules of propriety and expediency. The people have constantly before their eyes

the welfare of the nation, and in any emergency the question of whether it is wise or expedient to attack an action of the government or to call public attention to a delinquency of a public official will present itself. From the existence of the right it does not always follow by any means that it should be exercised on every occasion. As to when and to what extent the inherent privileges of a free press and of free public discussion may be exercised, subject to the law of loyalty, of truth, and of good faith, must depend in the last analysis upon the sense of propriety of every individual.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND PEACE PROBLEMS

Intricate Questions Upon Which Depend the Peace of Europe

By ROLAND G. USHER
[PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS]

NOT the military victory over Germany, now happily overwhelming, but the foreign policy of the United States promises to be from this moment forth the vital fact in determining the character of the peace settlement. The key to our foreign policy is now, and will continue to be, not the terms we propose to exact, in cooperation with the Allies, from the Central Powers, nor our own future relations with the latter, but our present and future policy toward our " co-belligerents " and "associates in arms."

The dominant factor in the relationship of the belligerents is the policy of this country, for it determines the relationship between them, which, in its turn, determines their relation to Germany and Austria, and their decision as to the fate of both. The gravest danger which this country may create for itself and others will result from our failure to choose purposefully a definite relationship to the various parts of the international structure, from an attempt to create co-operation with the European states in terms of isolation and of no entangling alliances.

There are those who object vigorously to the term " foreign policy," who shudder at the idea of diplomacy, who see lurking in those words, imperialism, secrecy, mistrust, the duping of the people, aggression. Yet whether we will or no, we have a policy. Such relations as the United States now has to other countries constitute our foreign policy.

Today the decision of the Allies as to the fate of Germany and Austria-Hungary rests upon the expediency of

attempting to deal in the future with those two nations as they had been before the war, or sanctioning and assisting certain movements in both nations tending to constitutional changes so sweeping as to affect their international position to a marked degree.

IMPORTANCE OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

IT is inevitable that the possible and probable arrangements in Europe must be made with reference to the United States, whose intentions in relation to foreign policy were, previous to the war, to all intents and purposes, absolutely unknown, not only to Europeans but to Americans themselves.

For the Allies and for the United States there exists a certain number of alternatives in regard to Germany and Austria, based necessarily upon the extent to which the existing coalition, created for the purpose of the war, may continue after the treaty of peace.

Let us suppose the coalition is entirely dissolved and that its present members cease to be pledged to each other and proceed to act without definite relation to each other's policies. Immediately every element in the situation has been evaluated. France and Italy, located by nature contiguously to Germany and Austria, and without definite pledges of immediate assistance, would find it extremely desirable to get into their own hands, not only their own military frontiers, but also the approaches to them in Germany and Austria, and would also prefer to see the overwhelming physical preponderance of those states destroyed. There would otherwise be no security.

If now the nations of the world should assume toward each other definite, mutual obligations in a league of nations and pledge their support and protection to France and Italy against aggression, the character of the league of nations would be the measure of the value of the guarantee which France and Italy received.

If Germany and Austria, unchanged in size and in government, should be admitted to the league of nations on equal

terms, and if the present Allies should not continue pledges of aid and assistance, the old balance of power would merely be reproduced in the league of nations. The councils of which would continually see a struggle for control of the league, in which France and Italy would be at a disadvantage and continually apprehensive of trouble. That would be far from security.

SOME LEAGUE OF NATIONS PROBLEMS

BUT if the present Allies should be willing to assume toward France and Italy more explicit and friendly relations than with Germany and Austria, to plan co-operation between themselves beyond that which they were willing to create with Germany and Austria, the league might then offer France and Italy definite security, because it would rest upon public pledges of assistance. This would, however, be tantamount to excluding Germany and Austria from the league on equal terms. It would indeed deprive the league of its character as an international government of equal sovereign states which the idealists are so anxious to insure. The attitude of the United States would decide naturally the fate of Germany and Austria and the fate of the league. For the physical power of the United States is such that it can never be disregarded, and sad experience has only too definitely shown that should Germany and Austria-Hungary retain their form previous to the war, the physical force of the United States would be essential in an emergency to offset their greater power.

But suppose the United States should in whatever way or for whatever reason—and so far as the European nations were concerned, neither would in the least matter—decide for a free hand itself in future policy, for a literal minimum of obligation of any sort to any foreign nation, for no ties or professions beyond those of natural sympathy—the result of comradeship in arms during the present war.

The league of nations would then become a loose, indeterminate association of sovereign states, from which France and Italy could not expect security, because its as-

sistance would be eventual rather than immediate, especially if the United States should fail to maintain a military establishment of its own of considerable size.

It would then become essential to create security upon the basis of European dispositions. Elaborate territorial concessions, considerable indemnities and financial guarantees would immediately become imperative. A series of extremely explicit undertakings between Italy and France and, in particular, of both with Great Britain, would become indispensable to reassure each other of the security which they would otherwise fear the United States might for some reason in a critical moment decline to give.

NO SECURITY WHILE GERMANY IS STRONG

NECESSARILY these decisions would preclude the admission of Germany and Austria on equal terms, if indeed the Allies did not feel it wise to decline to receive Germany and Austria at all until after a period of probation.

Suppose, on the other hand, that the United States is willing to enter clear, reciprocal, explicit understandings for the support and defense of France, Belgium, and Italy, and is willing to make public her agreements; suppose that she should come to some definite understanding about sea power with Great Britain; then a situation would exist—however phrased in international arrangements, through the machinery of a league of nations, or by the older method of alliance, written or implicit—which would render all parties secure against Germany and Austria with much less severe financial and territorial concessions. Both nations might safely be allowed to work out in such way as they should see fit their own administrative future.

While it would be desirable for Belgium and Italy to see the physical preponderance of Germany and Austria-Hungary abolished, it would under these circumstances not be imperative. Great Britain, secure on the seas by virtue of her understanding with France and the United States, would be less concerned about the fate of the German fleet and merchant marine.

Whether or not Germany and Austria-Hungary should be admitted to the league of nations on equal terms would naturally depend, partly upon what they themselves continued to be as elements of the international situation, and partly upon the constitution of the league of nations itself. If they continued powerful in size, efficient in government, security would not be possible so long as they entered the league as equal members. If they were reduced in size, especially if they were so reduced that their physical preponderance in population to a large extent disappeared, they then might be admitted as equal members to any league of nations.

In the end it would come to this: either the United States would agree to become an integral part of the European situation and form alliances or make understandings, or the United States would decline to become an integral part of the European situation, would make accordingly neither alliances nor understandings, and thus force the European states to settle the European situation upon a European and not upon an international basis.

CHANGING THE MAP OF EUROPE

NOW, in the light of these assumptions, what is the existing situation? What has been and promises to be President Wilson's policy? We must study first the facts of the situation and note what is done rather than what is said. The disruption of Austria is a fact, not merely a political and physical fact but a diplomatic fact, for all of the Allied nations had pledged themselves in advance to recognize the new states which are being formed out of the fragments of th Austro-Hungarian Empire. Those states, too, have been formally recognized by the United States, so that we may say without hesitation that the disruption of Austria-Hungary was deemed expedient by the Allied nations and by the United States. Once that fact becomes clear, we see that the fundamental policy is the creation of a balance of power in Europe by the weakening of the Central Empires. Otherwise the Powers would not have recognized the new states

and would, as in the past, have insisted that they should seek salvation and nationality through autonomy under the Austrian flag.

In the next place we know definitely that treaties were signed between the European Allies which provided definitely for the physical weakening of Germany. They proposed to take from her in the west the whole of the territory on this side of the Rhine, though they do not necessarily mean to add it to France. They have pledged themselves in the east to cede the great province of Posen to the new Poland, and have given a large section of Silesia to the Czecho-Slovak state. This means without question the loss of all of Germany's military frontiers, for without possession of its western bank, the Rhine itself ceases to be a German river and fortresses on the left bank, which might command the right, become possible. The loss of Posen exposes Berlin from the east, while the loss of Silesia sacrifices the roads on the southeast; the Czecho-Slovaks in Bohemia will probably be in control of the mountains and will hold the keys to Saxony and the roads to Berlin from the south.

DISARMING MITTEL EUROPA

THESE concessions will further involve a sacrifice of perhaps ten or fifteen millions of population, tremendous natural resources, and a considerable area of territory. Austria is to be reduced literally to Upper and Lower Austria and the old crown lands, a district containing probably about five millions of people and about a third the size of England and Wales. The German fleet and merchant marine will be so weakened, if not ceded altogether, that access to the sea will be most difficult for Germany and impossible for Austria and Hungary.

Considerable direct gains will be made by France and Italy. The economic and military value of Alsace and Lorraine is very great and there are not a few people. Italy will receive the Trentino and Trieste, and perhaps a good deal more, making a considerable accession of territory and of

population, but, of particular importance, giving her complete control of her own military approaches. The remains of Austria-Hungary will be organized in various Slav states with an aggregate of not less than fifty millions of people, all enthusiastically anti-German, and possessed of the military approaches to Germany on the east, with military control of Vienna and of the Hungarian plain, to say nothing of the Black Sea and the Balkans.

If a neutral state is created along the west side of the Rhine, as seems probable, Germany aud Austria would in the future find the problem of aggression extremely difficult. They would be separated from France by the Rhine and by a strip of neutral states reaching from the English Channel to the Alps. These they must first cross before they could approach the French boundary, where they would find literally the entire military approaches already in French hands. Any assault which they would make would be a frontal attack upon prepared positions. They would be separated from Italy by Slav states, larger in size, in the aggregate, than Austria, possibly as large as Germany, and, having crossed on the bodies of these active fighters, assuming such a fact possible, the Germans and Austrians would again find the military approaches in the foe's hands.

THE PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE

AND the foe in both cases would have been strengthened by the addition of part of the population which Germany and Austria had lost. It would seem true beyond the possibility of denial that the settlement, already in process of execution in Europe, proposes to create a physical balance of power of such character that France and Italy, with the assistance of the Slav nations, can maintain themselves against any conceivable assault from Germany or Austria.

It is now well to look at the facts about American foreign policy, partly as we see them in the statements of the President, partly as we see them to be from the statements of the Allied nations in reply. The President insisted at first that

the co-operation of the United States was to be immediate, determined, unlimited, but confined to a military and industrial co-operation during the war and primarily directed against Germany. Specifically he declined to sign treaties, to draw up agreements, to authorize understandings of any sort, type or character. In his very first documents and in his final speech to the Congress announcing the armistice, he declined to group the United States with the Allied nations, declined to use the term "Allies," persisted in the phrases, "associates in arms," "the Allied nations with which the United States is associated in arms," "the Allied nations and the United States," "the United States in co-operation with its associates in arms, the Allied nations in Europe." It would scarcely seem possible that language could be found to express more definitely and completely the President's notion that no arrangements concerning the present or future existed between the United States and any or all of our European associates for any purpose whatever. So long as in his public utterances such is the President's attitude, so long as he continues to insist, as he always has, that secret diplomacy is unworthy of statesmen and of a democratic nation, we can hardly suppose that he has authorized any secret understandings of the type which have often existed between nations.

SIGNS OF PEACE CONFERENCE DISCORDS

IF testimony and reason are of any value, the United States is not now and will not be, so long as the President remains of this same mind, in any way pledged to any of our Allies for the future. Yet his public utterances have lucidly and vigorously defined lofty and idealistic visions for the future of the world. He is determined that a real democracy shall emanate from the war in the internal arrangements of all nations, not less in Germany than in the United States, nor yet more in Germany than in America, England, and France. A real internationalism he has espoused, and is willing to go great lengths to insure its efficiency and permanence. The negative aims of his policy are scarcely of

less consequence than the positive. He is averse to any measure which smacks of imperialism; he has set his foot upon all changes which might create soil for future wars. In uncompromising phrase he has rejected secret diplomacy and all of its wiles and methods as an expedient which the United States can never utilize or countenance. He has more than once defined the league of nations and has insisted that Germany and Austria must become members, and, by implication, members on equal terms.

Between the United States and our associates there existed, so far as the war was concerned, so far as the terms of the armistice were concerned, complete accord. This was entirely consonant with the original position of the President which limited our co-operation to the conduct of the war and to the case of Germany. But despite acceptance of the President's fourteen points by the Allies and by the Germans and Austrians, to say nothing of lesser fry, all is not harmonious for the peace conference and for the future. The United States is not in agreement on some exceedingly important points with the Allies.

EUROPEANS WILL RAISE OBJECTIONS

THE formal note of November fifth of the Allied nations to President Wilson definitely and formally declined to accept the most important single point of the fourteen so far as the relationship of the Allies themselves is concerned, the second point, relating to freedom of the seas. They professed themselves literally unwilling to accept that clause in any construction whatever and explicity reserved for themselves complete liberty in all matters which it concerned. Inasmuch as our sole contact with Europe is necessarily by sea, they scarcely could have made a reservation more significant or important. The President's appeal to the country for the election of a Democratic Congress would also have been superfluous had he been in complete accord with the Allied nations, had he not proposed to urge at the peace conference policies which he was aware might meet with opposition.

The President has addressed himself to a task of the first magnitude and we shall be unwise to suppose that he does not recognize its appalling difficulty. That the chances are against his accomplishing such absolutely idealistic ends he knows, but he also sees that there is still a chance worth trying. In failure there can be no disgrace; in success there would be an achievement of which the statesmen of the ages have dreamed. It is not to be expected that the Europeans, who have more at stake than we, should hesitate and doubt, raise objections and desire to create additional safeguards of the old type. But such seems to be American policy: to urge certain international arrangements which contain for ourselves no very positive or direct gains of a selfish type, which involve possible risks for the European nations, but, could they be realized, would mark a stride forward in political organization of astounding import.

THE DOUGHBOYS' WAY

Thrills and Humors of the Battle Front Not Mentioned in the Dispatches

By DOUGHBOY

WE had been attacking for days, harpooning the Hun all the way up from the Ourcq, and now the order had come down to take that little town on the Vesle, called Fismes. Generally the telephone men follow the attacking lines of infantry, stringing their wire as they go. But this Fismes operation was so delicate that the Colonel in command of the regiment, which had been chosen to do the storming, wanted to be sure that his telephone lines would be working. It was imperative that swift communication be maintained between his headquarters and the *Poste de Command* of the leading battalion. To insure this he ordered a telephone detail to proceed at once toward the Hun lines, secretly laying wire to a place he had chosen from the map where the P. C. of the 1st Battalion would be when the attack had progressed to its first objective.

It was dangerous work; volunteers were asked for. The entire signal detail of the regiment stepped forward. With their telephones and coils of wire, the men in command of a Sergeant, stole out into the night.

"Call up regimental headquarters," the Colonel had said, "as soon as the line is working."

A half hour passed, the officers in the Regimental P. C. every now and then glancing anxiously at their phone. Down in the big dugout they could hear the hungry growl of the shells. Every one of them knew that the Huns were putting a terrific fire on that part of the terrain where the telephone men had gone. Five, ten minutes more, with everyone listening now anxiously for the Sergeant's ring. And then it came.

"Sergeant ——— speaking, sir. Communication is established."

"How is it out there?" the Adjutant asked.

"Pretty hot, sir. Two of my men killed, one wounded."

"Sergeant, you take cover with the others and leave one man at the phone. Have him ring us up every five minutes."

"Yes, sir."

Five minutes passed and, as ordered, the phone in the Regimental P. C. buzzed again, "Sergeant ——— speaking, sir."

"Sergeant, what are you doing on the wire?" the Adjutant called back. "I told you to take cover and to have one of your men stay there."

"Well, sir, I couldn't bring myself to tell a feller to stay in this place, the way the square heads are shelling it—so I stayed here myself."

That's the way of the "Doughboy." Tactically he makes up the bone and brawn of the army; he is the battering ram of the A. E. F., for artillery alone never won a battle. It's the "Doughboy" who drives off the Hun and who *occupies* the ground that the Hun held. And spiritually they are the soul of the A. E. F., for their's is the dirty work; their's the hunger and their's—bless them!—the genial grin.

Try to picture them, your Doughboys, tramping down one of the white, arrow-like roads of France on the heels of the Hun retreat . . . packs on their backs, powdery white dust chalking their bronzed faces and hands. They go swinging along—Widow Halligan's son; Jim, the soda water clerk; Al, who shot pool; Tom, who had just been made paying teller—crunching along to where the shrapnel bursts and whines. And they are singing,

Hail! . . . Hail! . . . Th' gang—sall here,
What th' hell do-wee care,
What th' hell do-wee care,
Hail! . . . Hail! . . . Th' gang—sall here,
What th' hell do-wee care, NOW!

Now that's the "Doughboy's" song in France. Back in the cantonments in the U. S. A., he used to like:

Good-bye Broadway, hello France,
We've come to pay our debt to you.

But if he caught a "Buddie" singing that mushibye now! Rather, he makes the historic silences of France ring to:

Oh, th' in-fan-tree—th' in-fan-tree,
Wit' th' dirt behind their ears;
But I'd rather be in th' in-fan-tree
Wit' th' dirt behind their ears
Than ca-val-ree or art-till-eree
Or a ———— ———— engineer.

HOW THE HUN WAS ROUNDED UP

ONCE more the bovine subjects of the "All Highest" were bound *Nach Paris!*—only this time as prisoners. It happened in one of those villages across the Vesle to which, for years to come, Americans will make pilgrimage, as to Gettysburg. Down a sunken road clumped some two hundred German prisoners, a young Prussian "shavetail" lieutenant strutting at their head. From time to time the Prussian shifted his eyes about in an endeavor to spot some American of high rank so that he might salute and perhaps curry favor. After noticing the young Hun servilly salute an American Colonel the Corporal in charge of the prisoners eased in alongside the Prussian.

"Don't be a boob," he said confidentially; "that stuff won't get you anything. It don't do you any good to bootlick 'round here,", and then, over his shoulder, he called to the Doughboys, "Come on fellers, this gang is movin' too slow."

And the Doughboy in the rear of the column who was puffing on a cigarette while alertly watching the gray-green

men he guarded, yelled out, "Cummon youse guys, git a move on. Git a move on."

Can't you hear its echo out of the past—a cop on some small city street corner?

And then there was that night in the cellar of a house at Cantigny. Here is how he told it: "And then I sees another squarehead stick his bean up and I walloped that with th' butt of me gun. But s'help me Joe, if another big cheese didn't put his nib in it and I shove him one in th' belly. Then, Joe, a mob of them—Cripes! they must have been twenty, beats it up outer a dugout pullin' this 'Kamerad' stuff on me, with hand grenades behind their backs. But you know what that gang did to little Petey Flynn—he was my Buddie, Joe, an' I owed them stiffs one for that. So I pulls th' old Sho-Sho on them, Joe, and them what wasn't sayin', 'Good morning Gawd' was squealin' 'Kamerad' real-like, this time, Joe. Then I brings th' mob of them back to th' Lootenant, Joe, and he ast me where did I get them birds and I says, 'Oh, up there somewheres. Do you want any more, sir?' He says, 'You bet I do,' so I beats it out and drags down four of them and a machine gun. I woudda had six, Joe, only two of th' boobs forgot t' say 'Kamerad,' an' I wasn't takin' no chances after what they did to my Buddie—do yer blame me, Joe? The Lootenant says he was gonna ast th' Captain ter recommend me fer th's Croiks de Ghwhere—but saay, Joe, a big scuttle of suds would look fine just now, hey boy?"

Back home you've heard his kind called "tough," haven't you? But up Montdidier way when the Hun flung two armies against the British's one he said in his own way, "They shall not pass."

In these glorious days the pariah of the proper has found himself; he's discovered that his hereditary enemy is not the Boss or the Cop, but the Hun. Even his gentler bred comrades in the ranks understand him now—where they didn't back home—and they love him. They know, too, that when the woods stink of poison gas, when the shell flares are fanning the night, when your throat is burning up and you're

lying out there, that more often than not, it's the "roughneck" who braves the *barrage* to bring you in—who is so careless with his own life, but not with yours. Perhaps it is because he thinks that your life is so much more worth while. Such things are truth.

THEY DIED ON THE GUNS

YOU remember little Jimmy who used to work in Fred Dawson's store, that colorless chap with the thin sandy hair? And Pete, who had the newsstand down at the station? And Bill Hayes, who did so well at college, and Tommy Lawson, who was supporting his mother? They're all in the A. E. F. now. They're all Doughboys, all toting Enfield rifles, and all wearing zinc helmets with broad leather straps under their chins and all cursing "Gas Defence" drill.

They crossed the Marne at five o'clock one morning last July—after the Marines and some Doughboys stopped the Huns at Château-Thierry. And chasing the Hun, our Doughboys were ordered to "get him." And they went so fast that their artillery couldn't keep up with them. The guns were no sooner unlimbered and emplaced than word would come back that our infantry had "gone on ahead." Yes, quite naturally the Doughboys chased the Hun that day without the artillery. They went at spluttering nests of machine guns, at German batteries, at anything that was in their road. Now much that happened can never be told. It died with them, but on the heights of the Marne one saw things and one could reconstruct what had transpired there. . . .

"There—just off to your left—just beneath the crest of that hill—do you see it? What a fight must have been there! Look, the German machine guns! And the German dead piled up. . . . Americans too. See that Doughboy there? He fell across the barrel. And that youngster, his hand is still on the cartridge belt. And the Corporal's hand still on the trigger. . . . They are German guns, but our boys had been firing them . . . they must have charged the nest! See, the Huns are bayonetted. . . .

And look out there . . . see, in the field—the German dead . . . hundreds of them. These four Americans then? . . . Yes, they took the guns and turned them on the Hun. They died with the guns turned toward Germany."

No wonder the French General blew a kiss as our Doughboys tramped past on their way back to "rest billets." "Ah, they are superb."

OUR DOUGHBOYS TEACH LUDENDORFF

IT was near Vaux that our Doughboys drove home some truths to the great Ludendorff. If one recalls correctly, it was this same Hun who sneered at the American idea of the "melting pot," terming it a "garbage can." It was Ludendorff who furthered the idea in Germany that we could put no efficient army in the field because we had no "conscious nationalism." The immigrants and the sons of immigrants who were in our land, refugees from absolutism, would not make soldiers, he thought. Only an autocracy could pound the "herd," as he termed it, into an army; and in the summer just past Ludendorff woke up.

A "Very Secret and Confidential" report that Ludendorff had written for the private perusal of his "higher commanders" fell into the hands of the Americans when the Boche made his headlong retreat from the Ourcq. In this report Ludendorff discussed again the subject of the American "melting pot," but it was a wiser Ludendorff.

"It is now possible," wrote Ludendorff in substance, "to determine the calibre of the American troops. The ———, ———, ——— and ——— Divisions may be classified as 'shock divisions.' Strangely enough they have many foreign born in their ranks, many former subjects of Central, Southern and Southeastern Europe and Poles. It is quite incomprehensible, but these men all believe it is their duty to fight for the United States. Although they are none of them of pure American stock—many indeed can scarcely speak English and are quite ignorant—yet they naively call America their mother-land and are proud to die for her. . . .

The obtaining of information from these prisoners was extremely unsatisfactory."

Perhaps little Ajax Promazalos had changed Ludendorff's mind about the "melting pot." This young black-haired Greek used to have a flower stand on the Busy Corner of one of our smaller cities. Perhaps you used to buy sweet peas of him. One rather imagines that Ajax was an anti-King Constantine Greek and that he had burned with the treachery of the Hun in his old land, for when we went to war Ajax went with us. He enlisted.

It's a long way from Syracuse—where they sent Ajax to help fill up a regiment of Regulars—to Sergy, which is near Château-Thierry, but the little Greek got there. He got much further too, far into the Hun line where the deep dug-outs were, for he had been made a Corporal and was in charge of the "mopping up" for his platoon. The dug-outs were many and the "moppers" were few and Ajax became separated from his squad.

FROM SWEET PEAS TO HUNS

WHEN, at his feet, he heard a muffled "*Kamerad!*" it seemed to issue from the bowels of the earth. Looking down over the edge of a shell crater he saw that it was the camouflaged entrance to a dug-out.

"How many you men down there?" he called.

A voice answered gutturally from the earth, "Vun hundred and thirty-six men, zwei officers."

Now Ajax was descended from the race that held Thermopylae, but a hundred and thirty-eight Huns—whew! He thought swiftly.

"I tell you," the little fellow shouted down the dug-out. "You better stay there, till I tell you come up. Not safe now," which was true. "A crazy regiment here now—that no take prisoners," which was not true,——— "I tell you when all right come up."

"Gott," a terrified voice rumbled. "Ve vill all killed become."

"You do what I say," Ajax cautioned the men under the earth, meanwhile casting anxious glances about him, for there was not an American near. "You keep quiet. Bye and bye, my regiment, a good regiment, make you prisoners, after these crazy fellers go. Then you get plenty to eat."

Apparently that satisfied the Huns, for he heard, "*Gut. Zu Befehl.*"

Ajax took a deep breath. *Where* were his comrades? He looked around No-Man's Land; not a man in sight; the attack had swept on. Off there were some medical men picking up the wounded, and far away he could see a detail, probably "M. Ps," but out of hailing distance. And there he was, alone with a hundred and thirty-eight Huns!

The minutes dragged with the Huns constantly calling up to him. Had the "bad regiment" gone yet? They had not, he told them. Perhaps it occurred to the Hun that they were being saved for a holocaust, even as they had saved those first Canadian prisoners. Dark fell and in despair Ajax took a splendid hazard. He shouted down to the Huns to leave all their arms in the dug-out and come up in single file and walk toward the American lines.

"My company," he brazenly explained, "is in shell craters all around but will not shoot. I have spoke to the Captain. You will get plenty to eat."

And so one hundred and thirty-eight Huns were led into the American lines by one little Greek who used to sell sweet peas for fifteen cents a bunch. . . . And the Hun dreamed of winning the war!

JOLTING THE KAISER'S STAFF

OUR Doughboys cannot understand the German officer. When they compare him with the human democratic men who wear the U. S. on the collar, the Doughboys are bewildered. They were bewildered at Soissons when they went through the Hun line so fast and so far that a whole German staff was scooped up before those exquisite creatures of the War Lord could make a get-away.

Picture that afternoon near Soissons—a circle of weary and dirty Doughboys, their helmets tilted over one eye, the tops of their coats unbuttoned in a most unmilitary manner, pulling at cigarettes or easing a good chew from one cheek to the other. Imagine in the midst of those quiet, battle-stained American boys, a Prussian staff officer of high rank. He was that long-headed, thin, ratty-faced type which one notices now and then in the Prussian aristocracy. With a monocle screwed in one eye he surveyed his captors. They surveyed him, particularly the tight collar of his uniform. "How can the guy breathe in that?" They made various comments about the gorgeous gray cape, lined with brilliant red, which fell gracefully from his narrow shoulders. But it was the boots that took their eye—glistening, black patent leather boots, such as they had never seen before, save in a Winter Garden show, and excruciatingly tight boots, to judge from the way he walked. Silently, here and there, a mouth parted as our Doughboys sized up their prize. To them, he was a being from another world—monocle, high collar, red-lined cape, patent leather boots.

"Hey, Sid," yelled one to a late comer, "get a look at this guy before I kiss him."

Presently, with the air of conferring a vast favor upon ordinary beings by permitting them to observe the act, the Prussian pushed back his cape and with a bored air felt in his pocket—"Gwan, yer big stiff!" Somewhat effeminately he drew out a gold cigarette case studded with diamonds and lit a cigarette; then he looked languid.

"Saay, Corporal," pleaded a big Buck Private, "lemme crown this guy," and he fondled the butt of his rifle lovingly.

"Saay, Bo," the Corporal admonished the Prussian, "I dunno how long I'm gonna be able ter keep these birds o' mine from layin' hands on you, so take a tip and get th' rest o' th' officers in yer mob here, and form 'em up. Then we'll march youse all back to th' cage."

"Corporal," said the Prussian in icy English, "you are impertinent. I shall report you to your superiors."

"Huh?" gasped the Doughboy. "And me tryin' ter be nice to the guy—hey boys?"

A mutter rose from his comrades, "Hand him one, Al."

But the Corporal turned down this advice; merely giving a tug at the Prussian's scarlet cape, "Cummon you."

Thunderstruck the Prussian regarded him. It was incredible! Hands—plebeian hands, moreover!—had touched the sacred person of an officer of the Kaiser's staff. He strove to speak but his face was purple.

"Cummon you," repeated Corporal Al, "and you other guys, too," this in warning to the shocked members of the exquisite one's staff. "Th' whole gang now. Forward . . . *March!*"

"But my rank!" gasped the Prussian, "It merits an automobile," and in alarm he glanced at his tight patent leather boots.

"Walk, yer terrier, *walk,*" grinned the Doughboy, "an' it's a good six miles to where the Lootenant said to bring all youse guys."

"FOR THE FOLKS BACK HOME"

IMPRESSED by the elegance of autocracy? Not easily, our Doughboys. They are not even impressed by Boche shells which fail to explode. Now a wise Doughboy will tell you to give these "Duds," as they are called, a wide berth; one slight jar to the delicate fuse and the shell may detonate. But some of our Doughboys—and I have in mind a certain ravenous souvenir hunter from Toledo—so scorn everything Hun that they include his "Duds." On inventory, this youngster from the Middle West owned a German helmet, the trigger of a machine gun, a Hun gas mask and the tile of a roof which had once sheltered him from shrapnel. These he planned to bring back to Toledo. But his collection wasn't complete; he didn't have a Hun shell.

One day a "77" tore into the ground just outside the parados of his trench, and plop!—it was a "Dud." The Hun machine guns were chattering with "sweeping fire,"

but that "Dud" was too much for the Toledo boy. Out over the top he scrambled and in a moment was back jubilantly exhibiting the unexploded shell.

"Get that damn thing out of here before it goes off," his comrades yelled; and they made him crawl out again over the top and lay the "Dud" where he found it. Coming back, the souvenir hunter was wounded. "I'm cured," he told the doctor.

Yes, the Doughboys are passionate souvenir collectors. Although what with kit and rifle, they carry over fifty pounds on their backs, yet they load themselves down with junk and carry it for miles and months. "It will be nice for the folks back home." The Doughboy can exhibit his handful of shrapnel— "wot almost nicked me"—his "*Gott Mit Uns*" belt buckle—"what I grabbed off a squarehead at the Marne." Some of the luckier ones have Iron Crosses, German money and *Kriegs* rings stowed about their persons, "for Dad."

The fun comes when prisoners are brought in. After our Intelligence officers have questioned the Boche and confiscated any letters, diaries or documents that may contain "information," the Doughboys' chance comes. Often, more often than not, our kind-hearted boys feel sorry for the Hun, believe he is starving and will give him of their own rations. They open negotiations with the Boche. A bargain is struck in pidgeon-German. "Iron Cross, Fritz? Ich gabe five francs for das." Eagerly the Boche will sell, generally with a smirk, perhaps telling himself in his "blood and iron" way that these Americans are fools, buying things from prisoners when they could so easily steal them. But he's all white, the Doughboy, and as clean as a whistle.

THE DOUGHBOY WINS THE HEART OF FRANCE

IN his thirst for knowledge of France the Doughboy is rapacious. Put him down in a village for "rest billets" and in an hour he'll have the history of the place and a line on the social standing of the inhabitants. Asked how he gathered this latter more delicate information, he will reply: "Oh, that's easy. All the houses have manure piles in the

front yard, haven't they? Well the feller with the biggest pile, he's the big guy of the village."

How the Doughboy manages to make himself understood when he talks to the villagers is astonishing. His is a weird French, and with his "com-prong," "mon-jay" and "toot-sweet" he has wee-weed himself into the hearts of the French. One sees a Doughboy walking down the village street with some French Miss who can only say "Allo" and "Gud morning"—and you know what the Doughboy is limited to—yet they always seem to get along and to be having the time of their lives. And, bye the bye, there are French mothers—than whom there are no more practical and frugal persons in the world—who are not at all averse to their daughters marrying Doughboys, the idea being for the Americans to remain in France after the war and help run the little business. And could you see some of these Mam'selles—well, girls, you'd write often to Johnny.

The French like our Doughboys and they like the French. Often you see an old Poilu and a young American. The Frenchman offers his new ally a swig of the wine in his canteen, *"Pinard?"*

"Wee, Wee," says the Doughboy and offers his cigarettes, "Cigarette Américaine?" and so the alliance is solidified.

But even before the Poilu met our boys, when the old man was busy holding the line and America was back in training areas, the Poilu heard of the Doughboy from his wife. And she wrote *pere* how the *belle* young Americans were always ready to help anyone in the village at getting in a crop, or weeding a garden—never, however, cleaning out the yard, that being a very high crime in rural France.

Yes, in those early days there was good-will between the Americans and the French; but still the French did not know. The Americans were *"très gentils,"* but could they fight?

See in your mind's eye that summer day when the French, outnumbered beyond all human resisting power, fell slowly back toward Paris and the whole world waited,

trembling. Imagine a dusty road confused with weary and heart-broken Poilus who had bled all the way from the Yser to Verdun, three, four wound stripes on their sleeves, ribbons for heroism on their breasts; and now, the thought that it had all been in vain, for the gray-green waves were rolling on—*Nach Paris!* Close your eyes and try to *see* that road—the bearded, grimey Poilus stumbling along, tears in some eyes, others openly weeping—"All is lost. They are too many." See the hopelessness in the face of that young officer who has just put down his binoculars to cry out, as he points north, east and south of him, "Boche there! . . . Boche there! . . . Boche there! . . . " The agonized cries as they recede before the Hun hordes, "Ah, our France, it is lost!"

And then down this road, up which they are retreating, a solid, swinging, dust-colored column comes into view. Hearts jump! One by one, then, whole companies of weary Poilus turn once more to face the Hun. Help is coming! "Les Anglais!" they cry ("The English!"). At the head of the oncoming column, a band is playing—a band as they march into action—"*Mon Dieu!*" The young French officer looks bewildered. Then he sees a flag; the colors are of his own France, but——

"*Sont pas les Anglais!* (They are not the English)," he cries. "*Mais les Américains!*"

Old Poilus take up the cry, "*Les Américains!* . . . *Les Américains!* . . ." It flies from lip to lip; a whole battlefield is ringing with it; by night all France will be shouting it; a day and it will go round the world—"*Les Américains!* . . ." And on they come, singing,

Hail, Hail! Th' gang's all here,
What th' hell do-wee care.

And as you know, the Hun stopped. . . .

"We stopped them," claim the Marines.

"Gwan, leather-necks! Youse wasn't th' only guys there," roar the Doughboys.

"*Quelle belle soldats!* You are superb," says France.

It's a fine old world for Americans these days—*Oui?*

NO RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—WHY?

The Impending Economic War at Home a Peace Danger

By RICHARD BARRY

Business has enlisted in war service. When it is mustered out, shall it be further penalized by the neglect of Reconstruction Regulation—labor must be neutralized—great questions are facing us—why are they shelved?

MAY not the shock of peace to this country be greater than has been the shock of war? Advisedly I use the word "shock." Not in its reference to the thought or feeling of the nation; but in reference to its industrial and economic life.

At the end of 1918, the United States is as ill prepared for peace as it was ill prepared for war in the beginning of 1917. Before presenting the problem, it is necessary to record that in Europe the exact opposite is the fact. For over three years Germany intensively prepared industrial and commercial programs in every phase of her life which she had hoped might place her in a position to start the peace race with an edge on all competitors similar to that she enjoyed when she entered the war race. For over two years Great Britain has been doing similarly. She has had a Reconstruction Ministry long at work, with 140 Committees, 6 Commissions, 16 Departments and 3 Advisory Boards. The English have so thoroughly and carefully subdivided and classified their work that they know today all that is humanly possible to know of what will have to be met and how it can be met immediately after the declaration of peace. On the problem of shipping alone, England has 25 Committees. Since the spring of 1916, France also has been officially preparing a Reconstruction program.

The United States alone is sailing blissfully into the future without taking any advance stock of what she may

have to face, how she can protect herself from possible dislocations of industry or how she can guarantee for her economic life the prosperity which the war should win for her.

To get a bird's-eye view of this problem, which is so vast that volumes could be written without exhausting it, let me present a short balance, as it were, of a ledger, and cast up the probable debit and credit sides of the after-war sheet.

THE AFTER-WAR CREDIT AND DEBIT SHEET

ON the credit side America will find:

(a) Her loss of human life probably will be comparatively small. Some millions of her best young men will have spent considerable time being broadened and instructed by cosmopolitan communion with foreign fellow-soldiers abroad; they will be disciplined and hardened by army training, and will return full of confidence, with new unprovincial ambitions, and inclinations.

(b) With man power largely unimpaired, she will face a war debt which should not worry her. One-third of it is really a good direct or indirect investment, and the other two-thirds simply has been taken out of one pocket and put into another, while on the right side of the account she will find herself the gainer in several important directions.

(c) For over four years, her industry has enjoyed unlimited demands for her productions, and when peace is signed, she will find this unlimited market for four years has caused her enormously to increase her producing capacity, and so to improve her producing methods as considerably to reduce her average pre-war cost of production.

(d) In addition to this, she will find the war has enormously increased the demands in foreign markets, and considerably weakened her principal foreign competitors, especially Germany, whose products will meet with serious damaging sentimental prejudice for years to come.

But look at the debit side:

(a) At least ten millions of laborers have been employed in filling war orders, in making munitions for war, and in supplying with food, clothing and otherwise, our armies in

the field, while at the declaration of peace the United States will have in uniform in the army and navy four or five million men. What will happen to affect these soldiers and these laborers? The first thing probably will be the cancellation of war orders. Every factory, every industry organized on a war basis will be obliged, in the space of a few days, to place itself on a peace basis and in doing this it will face the stark unknown.

(b) If there are two million or more American soldiers in France it may require two years to bring them all home, but many of them will return immediately. Meanwhile, and this as soon as peace is declared, those assembled in cantonments in this country may be disbanded. What are these soldiers going to do, their former occupations largely gone, and coming back to a world where industries may be partly if not wholly stagnant, where offices are filled with substitutes, where factories may be closing down?

(c) We have been floating in the high tide of an artificial war commercial activity. How many have saved the extra wages earned? How many are ready to meet a protracted period of unemployment? Of course employers will make every possible haste to switch their factories over to peace products and to reconnect with peace markets and peace customers. But all this takes time. How much time? Thirty days? Six months? A year? Each man should ask himself—what has he saved, what place has he ready to jump into when the one he now occupies is taken from him by the shutting down of the work or by the return of soldiers to whom the country owes first care.

(d) Remember, too, that this shock of peace will hit us at the moment when the cost of living is at its pinnacle. Never before in our history will bread have cost so much, never before in our history will clothing, fuel and the essentials of life have been so high. Millions will face on one side the chasm of unemployment and on the other the mountain peak of the highest prices ever known for living essentials. What will happen when demagogues may appear on every hand to preach anarchy and fear and envy and distrust, and

when the demagogue has for an audience not only those of his own ilk, but a possible vast number compelled against its will to be idle and hungry?

Out of these four items on the debit side of peace will arise many questions for America to answer. Let me here enumerate merely a few of them:

CONDITIONS THAT CONFRONT LABOR AND CAPITAL

WHAT will happen to towns like Hopewell, Va., occupied entirely in the manufacture of war materials? What will happen to inhabitants of such towns when the cancellation of war orders suddenly paralyzes their activities? Where are they going, and how are they to get fresh jobs? What are the merchants of these towns going to do?

(b) What is going to happen to the hundred thousand war workers who have been added to the city of Bridgeport? To Buffalo? To Dayton? To Detroit?

(c) What will happen to the huge plants now working on tanks, aeroplanes, shells, rifles and guns?

(d) What is to be the fate of the hundreds of thousands who are making army cloth and army shoes?

(e) How long will it take to refit the innumerable hospital ships for freight and passenger traffic?

(f) How long will it take for new credit books to be prepared throughout the world so that bankers will know what foreign merchants' credits are good?

(g) Do we know what American goods are required by France and Belgium, by Roumania or Russia?

(h) How long will it take to find out how much and what sort of goods we require and to arrange for these buyers a system of credit which should be bankable?

(i) How are shipping facilities to be distributed after the war? Is cargo space to be given to the highest bidder, and will the small shipper find the cargo space all taken up by his big competitors? Will our emergency fleet pass into private control, or be held by the Shipping Board—how and in what name?

(j) Is the Government going to retain the control and management of railroads after the war? Shall we continue to pay the present enormous increases in freight, passenger and express rates?

(k) Will the manufacturer continue to pay excess profits taxes, or will he be allowed to use this capital to support and carry on his business?

(l) What sort of new tariffs are foreign countries going to place upon American goods, and will this tariff make it impossible for American producers to sell in the world markets?

(m) What sort of new tariffs must America have to protect her increased industry?

(n) What sort of new organization laws will be required? If industrial conditions in enemy and allied countries are bad, are we to permit an unlimited flow of immigration to America which may easily make American industrial conditions equally bad?

WHY HAS CONGRESS DEADLOCKED ON THE QUESTION?

NOW, the obvious next question, which, in a sense, embraces all the others, is: Why has the Congress of the United States done nothing as yet toward finding answers to these questions or toward adopting a Reconstruction program, or at least toward securing and classifying the vast amount of information that must be on hand and certified for ready reference when the moment of peace arrives?

The answer is that already four ineffective attempts have been made in Congress to do something, but that none of these has gotten beyond the first preliminary stage of introducing the resolution. While this record proves the recognition of the existing need it affords slight comfort to the thinking American who wishes assurance that his Government is on the job.

These attempts were:

(1) On September 25th, Senator Weeks, of Massachusetts, introduced a joint resolution, calling for the appoint-

ment of a Committee on Reconstruction to consist of twelve members of Congress, six Republicans, six Democrats, each of whom would have charge of one of the major divisions of the grand work. This being a Republican measure, although asking for a bi-partisan control of the initial investigation, did not muster the necessary majority and is still tabled.

(2) Five days later, Senator Overman introduced a joint resolution calling for an appointment by the President of a lay Commission on Reconstruction, consisting of seven members, with salaries of $10,000 a year each. Although a Democratic measure, and with the sanction of the Administration, it could not muster sufficient support, for reasons which will be later explained, and was referred to the Committee on Judiciary where it still remains.

(3) A Republican Senatorial Committee next suggested that one Congressional Committee could not possibly be large enough or have the time to adequately consider Reconstruction and it therefore proposed that instead of one there be at least six Committees. However, such a measure had not received even the dignity of being offered as a resolution up to November 1st.

(4) The Democrats in the House Appropriations Committee, slyly attempted early in October to accomplish in an indirect way, practically the same thing aimed at by the Overman Bill. This was in the form of a rider tacked on to the general appropriation bill, calling for $250,000, to be used by the President for the necessary expenses of a War Salvage Commission, which was to have five Commissioners with salaries up to $10,000 a year, and to have an official life "six months after the President declares peace to be established." This latter phrase shared the ambiguity of the rider itself, as it did not say "After the declaration of peace," thus giving the Chief Executive a lee-way to be exercised in his own discretion. The House Democrats were checkmated on this, however, as the rider was thrown out on a point of order as an effort to enact original legislation under the guise of being a part of the war budget.

None of these attempts to get Congress, or the Government, or both, to work on Reconstruction have been successful. All have proven abortive. Why?

One obvious reason is that Americans never have acted like Europeans in articulating far in advance constructive commercial and industrial schemes when these have required a program on the part of Congress. It has been our habit in these matters to act after rather than before the event; which is in sharp contrast to our national character, expressed individually or corporately.

However, at this time and in this matter, there is delaying progress and frustrating vital preparation an issue which, probably by the time this is published, will have become apparent to all, as it is now apparent to a few who know how the advance skirmish lines have been thrown out.

SHALL THE PRESIDENT OR CONGRESS SHAPE RECONSTRUCTION POLICIES?

THIS issue is: Shall the President or shall Congress shape the policies for Reconstruction? The delays of the last ninety days, when to save time was so imperative and essential, may have been due solely to the fact that the President apparently has been determined to place himself in a position whereby he could control the Reconstruction policy; while Congress, recognizing instinctively the vast importance of this attempt, has preferred to do nothing rather than to place itself in a position where it might be obliged to continue delegating after the war the legislative powers which it willingly delegated to the Chief Executive under the stern necessity of war itself.

If either of the Democratic measures had been passed, the Overman Bill or the rider to the Appropriations Bill, it would have meant that a limited Commission appointed by the President would have complete charge of the preliminary work of Reconstruction. As the preliminary work may well be the most important and the most far reaching work of all, a majority of Congress, including all the Republicans and

enough Democrats, refused to permit these measures to become law. They recognized that whatever schedule was laid down in the beginning concerning any of these problems would have an extraordinary influence in shaping the immediate future of the nation, and that this influence might indeed be the commanding influence of the coming generation.

Because the thought of the members of Congress as well as of the people generally for the few months preceding November 11th was wholly absorbed in the military fortunes of the armies in Europe, and in the progress of armistice negotiations, these other problems, the ones which will dominate all of the immediate future after the war, have been allowed to go by default, while neither Congress nor the President would bring into the open or make a resounding issue of the overwhelming conflict that may be seen as underlying the approach to Reconstruction.

THE HIDDEN CONFLICT

IN the inevitable nature of things the President some day must cease holding the legislative reins that he has held during the war. It has never been contended by anyone that the Chief Executive should encompass the legislative powers of the Government within his own proper executive ones, excepting so far as the imperative necessity of war time measures should demand it, yet two of these measures introduced in Congress sought to extend into the post war period a condition which has been accepted as merely temporary. The fact that this construction must be placed upon their meaning further emphasizes their indirection, both in intention and in effect.

The true meaning of these measures (one calling for a Presidential Reconstruction Commission, the other for a War Salvage Commission, to be appointed by the President) is this: They aim indirectly to take from Congress the solving of the Reconstruction problem; they seek indirectly to extend indefinitely the Presidential war powers; they indirectly seek to add complication, delay and indecision to a

problem in which the chief element to overcome is that of time itself. Because, even though a Presidential Commission might make reports on the Reconstruction problem which the President might use as a basis for recommendations to Congress, it would then be obligatory for Congress to make for itself its own investigations before enacting legislation.

The question obviously in the minds of those who refused to let the measure pass was: why not let Congress make its own investigations and its own recommendations at first hand? Congress, therefore, apparently has regarded these measures as specious pleas for war time power which probably would be extended far into the peace period, but without any adequate assurance that there was no eventual ulterior object.

This, then, is the hidden conflict that has added a few months' delay, time unaccountably precious, to the normal postponement of Congressional consideration of Reconstruction. The time will doubtless come when this period will be surveyed as one of iniquitous hesitation, as one in which a failure to take some action proved worse than almost any action that might have been taken.

SHALL WE HOLD OUR WAR PROSPERITY?

ASIDE from the question of how and when something shall be done to solve these problems there is the all embracing question of whether or not America will be able to make secure the future prosperity which is offered her as a result of the war. That prosperity can be only the compound of the individual prosperity of her many citizens.

On the declaration of war the Government rightly commanded the services and the wealth and, if needed, the lives of all who enjoyed the protection of the flag. That was a positive act, a war necessity.

At the declaration of peace the Government will become sponsor for an act no less important to all its citizens, although a negative one, when it takes the war away. In taking the war away, it assumes no less a duty than it de-

manded of its citizens when it called upon them to sustain it on the declaration of war. This duty is to safeguard the transfer of its industries and of the work of its millions from a war to a peace basis in such a way that there may be no undue losses, that business men may not be bankrupt, and that laboring men and women may not be compelled unjustly to meet the terror of unemployment, and that neither will suffer the clash of economic disturbances that breeds strikes, lockouts and radically fluctuating prices.

If the Government summons to its colors all loyal citizens, does it not at the conclusion of the war owe a debt to the millions of young men who have fought for it every opportunity which they temporarily foreswore that they might carry on the flag of the Republic?

If on the declaration of war the Government demanded of all civilian workers that they toil for it without thought of selfish advantages, does it not at the cessation of the war owe them the assurance that their future means of livelihood shall not be denied them through a dislocation of industry resulting from a paralysis of the very activity in which they loyally have engaged?

If the Government, directly or indirectly, has been obliged to induce women in large numbers to change their methods of life and become enrolled in the nation's industrial and commercial army, is it not obliged to assure them that they shall not be unjustly discriminated against on the return of pre-war conditions, probably intensified? Or shall some governing board be established to insure impartiality in the post-war adjustment of the ratios between male and female labor?

If the Government, directly or indirectly, has induced business men to invest capital and to rearrange all of their affairs so that they might expeditiously manufacture war materials, does it not also owe them the duty of guaranteeing that they shall be protected from undue losses by the mere fact of the stoppage of that for which they are now organized, and in the successful accomplishment of which they have concentrated every financial and mental resource?

These questions demand the intensified work of *all* of the best brains of America. Why did they not earlier begin to find their answers?

Whether we will or not, the scope of the inquiry is beyond the grasp of any individual, set of individuals or organization of individuals. Only the Government, with impartially selected commissions, and not any one branch, is competent to undertake the solution, as the Government alone will have the power eventually to regulate the necessary provisions.

THE CHOICE

By J. CORSON MILLER

WEALTH hung a wreath of roses 'round my brow,
And said: "For certain, thou art happy now.
In all this world to thee is naught denied—"
"Excepting love," I answered him, and sighed,
For I was sad.

Love placed a crown of thorns upon my head—
"Thou must go down, ev'n unto death," he said;
"Hast thou the soul to meet the stern emprise?"
"Lead on!" I begged of him, with kindling eyes—
For I was glad.

PERSHING—OVER THERE

As Seen in Action with the A. E. F.

By "PRIVATE" ALDEN

NOT long after Pershing's "First Thirty Thousand" marched through Paris in 1917, Robert Underwood Johnson wrote for the FORUM a widely-copied poem, the first lines of which, read today, prove wonderfully prophetic:

"Oh, to be in Paris now that Pershing's there!
To hear the waves of welcome that greet him everywhere;
To see the children and the girls a-pelting him with flowers,
And feel that every petal is meant for us and ours;
To know the brave smile's come again to worn and widowed
France——"

It is the same Pershing in Paris today, the same erect, square-jawed soldier, that marched through the Capital of France in those grim days when the Teutonic beasts seemed at their strongest, their most inhumane.

But the test that stamps a man's character, his personality and his place in public opinion, must, after all, come from they who know him best, his own people. His coming was naturally hailed by the French, as would be the coming of any leader of men arriving to help in a black hour of dire need. His test was not only his military achievements but his place in the minds and the hearts of the two million Americans who ultimately made up the American Expeditionary Forces under his command.

There are two sorts of fighting men, those who click their heels together, who walk and speak and seemingly think like automatons; and the others who are equally strict in their military bearings but who keep a warm heart beating beneath their tunics. Pershing has the heart. He is human, he knows men, he understands the American dough-

boy from the sole of his march-blistered feet to the shrapnel dent in his "tin hat." The doughboy knows that he knows, and he speaks of "Gen'r'l Pershing" not with fear or awe but with pride.

PERSHING IS "SO-O-OME GUY"

THE individual fighter at the front knows little of what is going on outside his own little section of trench. The man back home who brings in his morning paper from the front stoop and props it up before him at breakfast soon knows far more of what has been going on during the preceding twenty-four hours than any of the boys who were over there helping to make it "go on." And when, after a hard time of it at the front pushing back the enemy, the boys are relieved and go back for rest, the first thing they seek is a newspaper so freely provided over there that he may know what he has been doing and what his comrades in arms in other sections have been doing.

One of these muddy doughboys, just back from the firing line, looked up from the paper with popping eyes and an ear-to-ear grin after reading of one of our successes.

"Ma-a-an!" he exclaimed, "Gen'r'l Pershing is *so-o-ome guy!*"

Only one thing in the world will make a commanding officer "so-o-ome guy" with the bayonet-pushers, and that is a personality that appeals to them.

Over there General Pershing has been, as one of his staff Americanized it, "strictly on the job every minute." The affair was no picnic, no sight-seeing tour, it was fighting from the start, and to the last. Pershing kept this uppermost in everyone's mind.

With some French officers Pershing was reviewing a body of French troops whose colors were about to receive that coveted honor, a decoration. Just as the officers were marching at their stiffest before the eyes of Pershing a little French boy, disheveled and muddy from squirming through the crowd, waved a rather tattered fragment of the Stars and Stripes that he had secured in some mysterious manner.

In the shrillest of boyish trebles, heard clearly above the measured tramp of marching feet, he shouted:

"Vive Pairshing!"

HE TALKED LIKE A NEIGHBOR

INSTANTLY Pershing wheeled and faced the lad. He did not grin, he did not wave his hand joyfully as most men would at a grinning boy, he did the one thing that made that little lad the happiest, he stiffly and smartly saluted the little chap, then turned to watch the marching men.

Pershing had temporary quarters in a small town—he was forever going about France and always for a purpose that made for a speeding up of efficiency of the A. E. F.—after he had gone and some other officers, stopping there somewhat later, learned of his previous presence, one asked of the woman who owned the place:

"How did our General look to you?"

"He look like ze statue carve out of stone, but he speak to me like a good neighbor who live long next door."

In Washington in 1917 there came a cablegram of great length to the War Department from Pershing that caused some of those who read it to slightly elevate their eyebrows and murmur something about "red tape" and "formalities in combat." It was a request that all of our soldiers in cantonments be thoroughly groomed in "military courtesy." Pershing emphasized the necessity of this. And at the same time he issued to our troops over there several general orders dealing solely with the salute. It must be correct, it must be brisk, snappy, stiffly military. No slighting of it would be permissible.

Now they over here could not know the need of all this over there, but had they had the good fortune to have been over there they would have known in a flash why the commanding officer of so great a force should take the valuable time to give thought to salutes and the almost endless variety of strict military courtesies. Pershing was pictured, as so many generals have been painted, frowning deeply over a great military map, talking strategism, planning strategism, thinking strategism and dreaming strategism.

He knew something of the stiff formalities of European armies, of military courtesies abroad. And he found that the great struggle had not lessened these, had not permitted them to relax; hence his cabled orders to brush up our forming armies in cantonment here.

A STICKLER FOR MILITARY COURTESIES

THE soldiers of all armies over there expect it, and it appealed to Pershing, he believed that all men would become more efficient for it. Just as in the matter of personal appearance. No unpolished shoes must fall beneath his glance, no unshaven jowls, no tarnished buttons or unbrushed clothes.

"A man thinks more of himself, and consequently he performs his duties much better when he keeps clean and well groomed, it makes him alert, that's why Pershing is such a stickler," was the explanation given. There was a reason for it all, it tended to increase efficiency and Pershing went over there to see that American efficiency achieved top notch and remained there. He wasn't there on dress parade, but to help kill Germans. If adaptness in military courtesies, if the ability to give perfect salutes, if shining shoes and clean jowls and spotless tunics would increase that efficiency, as it was so well proven that they would, then Pershing would insist on them.

We have read, and doubtless the incidents were mess-room talk, from Pershing's West Point days to date, about our commanding officers in the Civil War who would throw off their coats and slouch into mess in shirtsleeves. Those have been called by many a brave old veteran the "good old days." But, when in Europe, do as the Europeans do so long as it means something worth while, was Pershing's motto. That he arrived in France with eyes and ears wide open, saying little but seeing and hearing everything, we all know. And it did not take him long to sift the chaff from the wheat. Whatever he learned that he saw would benefit our troops he promptly adopted and whatever habits and customs our troops may have had that were useless or detrimental, they vanished into thin air at once.

They were talking about him one day at a Paris café, some English, French and American officers, just as they talked about Foch and Haig, Pétain and Plummer and others. Said an American officer, "You will remember that in almost every story of a successful man who once taught school—and their biographers generally included this incident whether it happened or not—comes that hoary old anecdote of the time that the subject of the biography had to whip a scholar about ten times his size."

THE "KILL OR BE KILLED" SPIRIT

HIS hearers agreed. Probably half the big men of today who arose through their own efforts either taught school or were credited with doing it. The American officer continued:

"I read that Pershing, when eighteen, taught school at Prairie Mound, whipped one of the unruly boys and that this boy's father, the town bully, feared by everyone, came to school to simply beat Pershing to a pulp. The story goes that young Pershing picked up a club of oak firewood and told this man, 'Wildcat Card' they called him, to get out. Wildcat grinned and advanced. 'Get out or I will kill you,' is what the writers quoted Pershing as saying.

"When I read this I tossed it down and exclaimed, 'Bosh! that's what all biographers write,' but since I have seen General Pershing, learned how he works and been in his company over here on duty on many occasions, I am inclined to believe that story and I am sure that if this 'Wildcat Card' chap had not backed out, the little town of Prairie Mound would have had a funeral and it wouldn't have been young Jack Pershing riding inside the hearse."

Pershing over there gave all who had opportunity to watch him the same impression, bulldog tenacity, a good square friend if you met him, but the sort of an enemy that carried on to the end. Some of the captured German reports described the American soldiers as men who were there to "kill or be killed." That was the way Pershing impressed

everyone over there who came to know him, and it was the spirit instilled into our soldiers.

"By word of mouth" means even more in army life than in civilian. The news that Pershing personally complimented this doughboy or ordered that inconspicuous young officer to be promoted because of something that merited it, not necessarily valor in action, spreads rapidly. It flies around through the army in some mysterious way through those intangible channels that can only be described as "by word of mouth." This doughboy sees something that gives him an insight into the personality of Pershing and makes him repeat those classic words, "He's so-o-ome guy." He tells his buddy, who repeats it to another, and it may go to an officer's orderly and from there on and on. That is how our soldiers over there know so much about the personal side of Pershing.

The 78th Division had not been long in France when the time came for Pershing to inspect it.

"Pershing's coming to inspect us!"

PERSHING AND THE PLATOON

THE "word of mouth" flew up and down the lines, from barracks to officers' mess. From the Brigadier General down to the newest young Lieutenant there was a trace of nervousness, not exactly a "trembling in the boot" but a worry, a wonderment as to whether they could possibly squeeze by or would have to go in for more intensive training. Not so the doughboys. They were fit, they knew it, they felt that already weeks had been wasted on them and that they might just as well have pitched in and licked their share of the Huns long ago. Of course it was a great thing to have Pershing inspect them. They all hoped to get an "eye full" of the commander and probably every one secretly wondered what he would do or say if Pershing should by any miraculous chance speak to him.

They were drawn up in readiness.

"Pershing's here!"

The word went about, or perhaps a wink, a nudge, or some other slight sign, it all meant the same and in the terse lexicon of the doughboy long sentences are unnecessary.

Pershing approached, he walked with perfect West Point precision, but his eyes saw everything, including a very young Lieutenant and his platoon. Pershing paused, the Lieutenant saluted smartly, Pershing returned the salute with equal smartness.

Of course it was silly of the Lieutenant to think for an instant that General Pershing would bother to inspect one little platoon, one trifling handful, when he had come to inspect the entire division, yet Pershing was there in front of him, he had come only to inspect, he did not expect the Lieutenant to make a speech and the Lieutenant knew that Pershing was not going to make a speech. There was but one thing to do, absurd as it seemed to him, form his little handful of men for inspection.

"Open ranks—March!"

The Lieutenant gave the command, the doughboys whipped into formation for inspection as if they were automatons with brand new and extra snappy springs inside them instead of human muscles.

Pershing's face was about as expressive as that of the Sphinx. He walked down between the short lines, the boy, who only yesterday had been sent over from Plattsburg, following and, so far as he can now remember, quite forgetting to breathe.

Brigadier Generals and Colonels and Lieutenant Colonels and Majors of the division waited, and waited. Pershing looked at every man in the platoon, at every button, legging, gun—there wasn't a detail that his sharp eyes missed. Suddenly he stopped in front of a corporal and looked at him sharply, looked him straight in the eye.

The corporal stared straight ahead, not at Pershing but through him. He was as motionless as a pyramid, he didn't bat an eyelash. Pershing was so pleased that he almost permitted himself to smile.

"You are a soldier. What is your name?" said Pershing.

PRAISE FROM PERSHING

THE corporal told him, not stammering, not choking, but straight out in clear syllables, with the "Sir" at the end. Pershing did smile then, and turned to the trembling young Lieutenant.

"A fine lot of soldiers you have here," he said.

If, on the next day, that Lieutenant had chanced to stroll across No-Man's-Land and bring the Kaiser and Hindenburg in, prisoners, he would not have been more than one-sixteenth as proud as he was when Pershing said to him, "A fine lot of soldiers you have here."

"'*You.*' He said it to me!" exclaimed the youthful officer later.

It seems a small thing. But it was typical of Pershing. Not at long range did he inspect the whole division, but he chose an obscure little platoon at random, found it to be perfection, and said so in as few words as possible. The men of that platoon will probably never lose the smile that Pershing's personal inspection brought to their faces. "Pershing praised *our* platoon," they boasted. Their company took it up. "Pershing praised a platoon of *our* company," the members boasted, in turn. The regiment took it up, "Pershing praised a platoon in one of *our* companies!" And so they all took it upon themselves, praise, though indirectly, yet to them, through brigade and division.

Always in need of ships, the more speed put into unloading them at the French ports, the quicker they could go back and return with more men and supplies. The work of unloading was done largely by American negroes, enlisted men, to be sure. It was natural that many of them should become restless. To be "wrastlin'" with heavy cargoes, piecemeal on trundle trucks, day after day, was not conducive to their happiness.

"JUST NACHERALLY GOT SENSE"

"OH Lordy, Lordy, jes' gimme a sharp baynit and let me at them boshes, that's all," was their 'plaint.

Pershing heard of it. He didn't send them a note, he didn't send orders. He took train across France and visited these colored men.

"The quicker you unload these ships the quicker we get more men and more supplies. The quicker we get more men and more guns and more ammunition, the quicker the enemy will be licked. If you do in one day the work that would ordinarily take two days, you will be the ones who will have brought the war to an end one day sooner for every day that you do this."

The colored men nodded, involuntarily, in agreement. Pershing did not say "defeated," he said "licked," a good old word that every colored man knew all about. He talked to them so that they understood.

"I have commanded colored troops, they were the best soldiers I ever served with. The best soldiers obey orders without question. I know colored people, I had a dear old black mammy at home to take care of me. I just came over here to tell you that I know of the hard work and the good work that you are doing at these docks, and I want you to know that your work is as important as any in the front line trenches."

And when Pershing got back across France to his headquarters there was a report wired on, already awaiting him, telling him how those colored men had redoubled their efforts, speeded up and broke all records in their line of work, and they kept it up.

"Pershin', eh?" said one colored soldier, working at the dock, "Well, well, he jes' nacherally got sense, that man."

A writer arrived at the Pershing headquarters. Pershing was busy. It was Summer. He could look through the open window. Pershing was sitting at his table desk, writing.

"It must be something very secret, something of great importance, that he does it himself instead of having an Aide de Camp do it," commented the writer chap.

"Yes, sir," was the reply. But the truth was Pershing was personally writing to a month-old boy up in the Bronx, in New York, telling him how pleased he was that this baby's parents had named him "Pershing."

Pershing likes to watch and to listen, but he can talk when occasion demands. His French is practically without accent, his phrases are crisp and to the point. When he stood before the tomb of Lafayette there was excuse for a long oration, for a windy bombast of spread-eagle words and phrases. But it wasn't Pershing's way of talking, any more than his way of working. He said:

"Lafayette, we're here!"

WHAT DOES RECONSTRUCTION MEAN?

Problems Involved at Home and Abroad

By HON. J. HAMILTON LEWIS
[U. S. SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS]

(*An Interview with the Forum*)

SO much depends upon how we apply the English language, how much reliance can be placed upon the uses of words, that as we approach the interesting phases of world reconstruction we must not forget that we also approach the language of world diplomacy. Diplomacy is constructive not reconstructive, because if it were otherwise it would become too complicated for treaty purposes.

The chief thought of our reconstruction in this country carries with it no secret advantage. It has above all other qualities a hope for intelligent results. No appeal to American intelligence is ever wasted, and therefore, divested of the difficulties of natural sentiment which is involved in the task of reconstruction, the Americans have only to protect their intelligence. This they have always done, and there is no reason to expect that they have lost the gift. However, the length and significance of the word "reconstruction" itself, permits speculation. There are questions to be answered that are almost intangible. For instance one of them is, "what is there in this country to reconstruct?"

There is really nothing. The return of the men from the front should bring no greater surprise or effect upon the existing order of business than when soldiers came back from Mexico, or from Cuba. The war has not done actual damage to our country, as it has in Europe. Our fields are protected, our houses are intact, our industries have increased their efficiency if anything throughout the war. In spite of our business sacrifices we have loaned enormous

sums to our neighbors across the water, and we have more to spare ourselves than we ever had before. The casual observer looking over this land of liberty sees no outward signs of things to reconstruct. And yet he is impressed with the necessity of reconstruction.

Of course he is.

We have emerged from this war with a realization that there is new blood among us, we feel the stir of a vast responsibility to that new blood. Our territories seem to be extended, our system of trade needs changes to meet the larger growth, our senses are tingling with a duty of neighborly obligation that will adapt themselves to the common interests of humanity.

"RECONSTRUCTION" MUST BE ASSOCIATED WITH EUROPE

THERE is some meaning to this word "reconstruction" and yet how are we going to grasp it without business changes being involved, without our national character being challenged?

Personally, I do not think the word itself is suitably chosen for the crisis of affairs. It has been handed down to us from the days of the civil war. At that time it was well chosen. After the civil war one-half of our homes were burned down, one-half of our households were destroyed, we were mortally wounded among ourselves, we needed immediate reconstruction. The word does not apply to the present conditions in this country as it did then.

It has a far greater meaning to the devastated regions of Europe than it has to us. It affects us only in our coming relation with the people of the old world, because of them we are involved in the meaning of the word. Europe lies charred, torn, bleeding from the disaster of the war. Many of the people are in the last stages of despair, their strength is gone, and yet they stand bravely in rags and tatters, loyal in their devotion to the ideals which this great republic has maintained so brilliantly. To the Americans reconstruction must therefore be associated with Europe. We are in the position today of a creditor nation to Europe, we are not

only bound to the welfare of the old world by ties of humanity but by ties of economic interest. The war has brought us into new forms of industrial problems from which we can profit only if we demonstrate a farsighted patience, only if we moderate our business habits with conciliatory sentiments for a bankrupt people.

To visualize better the nature of the word reconstruction as it affects our relation with the war stricken countries, we might say that as a nation we hold an immense mortgage on Europe. But while our advantage in this respect is great, we cannot afford to measure that advantage by the usual standards of mortgage rights. It is doubtful if we have thought at all in these terms of the business relation in which we stand with Europe. For illustration, however, these relations, as I have projected them, facilitate the understanding of the problem of reconstruction in Europe. Our share in it, aside from the plain humanitarian character of sentiment which has already done, and is still doing, so much for the love we bear those victims of a hideous military menace, is to enable the final payment of that huge mortgage.

WE MUST MAKE GOOD OUR MORTGAGE ON EUROPE

IT would be very shortsighted for us to wish to foreclose upon a property that was already destroyed when by just and careful management we can enable Europe to pay the obligation of that mortgage. That is one of our chief tasks in reconstruction. In it we shall find many interesting problems of finance to overcome, but we can meet them, we can wait till the period of restoration has come, because we are more prosperous now than we were before the war.

As to Europe, our prospect of reconstruction involves faith in our investment, an attitude of helpful, patient, indomitable trust in it. Just now there is, perhaps, no thought of this phase of our relations to Europe, because we are absorbed with the horror of those who are suffering there, of sympathy with the political change of heart that has seized all Europe, with our natural understanding of the

shock that has temporarily disturbed the economic character of Europe.

In the meaning of the word reconstruction there lies also the purpose of business stability, of restored trade, of an equitable balance of merchant life. It will be some time before this balance can be reached, and no impatience of profiteering, of anxiety for the future, of scrambling by competitive methods will bring it about. Behind the true meaning of the word reconstruction lies the large stride of the nations abroad, for upon the political decisions, upon the adjustment of religious differences, upon the softening of the passions and sentiments that have been roiled up by the storms of war, depends the economic settling of affairs. What we must do at once is to tighten the bonds of friendship that unite us, to assist the distress, to enable the wounded economic conditions in Europe to return to normal. If the word reconstruction is to remain in our thought as a pivot of opinion upon which we measure the rights and the wrongs of our future transactions with Europe, it must be considered with the utmost confidence by us. Our ability and our confidence must be in accord in trade, to resume our relations with European industries upon a far more prosperous basis than we have ever had before. That, to my mind, is our course of reconstruction in Europe.

WHAT WE MUST DO IN AMERICA—AND ABROAD

AS to America. As I have said, there is no internal reconstruction of a reactionary nature necessary. I am not assuming that political rumors of vast changes will occur. I am assuming that we, and this country, are economically so safe and sound that in our personal exchange of business we have only to go ahead. Our roads are open, our industries are solvent, our homes are in order, our money is well invested, we are ourselves well off. The matters that may come under our interpretation of reconstruction concern our temptation to impose barricades in trade. This we must not do. We must see that we maintain a delicate balance in exports and imports. We must not take advantage of the

necessities of others now, lest later on when the new social order has come about they take a similar advantage. We must nurse our foreign trade, we must look far ahead. With the political trend of the world towards republics we shall one day be one vast people on this earth dealing directly with one another. It is obvious that former standards of competition will be exposed to ruthless scrutiny. The merchants of the world will supply each other according to the will of the people they sell to, because there will be an end to preferred groups, to organized trade in corners. It is hopeful to believe that we shall have to reconstruct our ideas of commercial value, if we do not, if we are not in accord with the new order of social conditions we shall foster a boomerang in any effort we make to centralize our trade advantages. If we do not realize the new order of republics in the world, if we do not recognize the character of these republics, we will find an unexpected competition, an aggressive trade from Japan and South America, the two countries whose strength has been untouched by the war.

We must foresee that there will be no difference of trade advantage between the merchants of the world then. Behind them will be the people to balance their transactions. The merchant in Europe will deal with the merchants in America according to a world standard of business conscience. There will be no barrier, no screens, no secret prices, no adjustments that are not fair.

A WORLD CONSCIENCE IN TRADE

OF course these are questions of reconstruction, but they are in final analysis really matters of construction which this great war has helped bring about. The products of the earth will be for all the people, not for the few, but they will not be distributed according to radical dreams. They will pursue the present course of value for value, but the values will be closer to a true valuation. By degrees the balance of affairs, enormously extended, vastly simplified in trade, will rise to a grand level of equality. Merchants will deal with each other without suspicion because there

will be nothing to suspect. The republics of the world will dominate the conscience of trade.

As to the armies and navies of the world, they will be maintained, but upon a new order of reconstruction they will operate in accord with the neighborly obligations of their duties. They will not be in conflict, they will be in unison. Instead of being a menace to the safety of the people they will be their security.

Thus we have the three corners of the world's triangle, the pedestal upon which the proposed reconstruction of the world will stand. Above all things it is an issue of financing. If the financing is wisely done, well and good, if it is not the consequences will be serious. But I believe that in any event it will not be reconstruction, it will be construction.

A JAPANESE PRINT

By RUTH MASON RICE

A CURVE for the shore,
A line for the lea,
A tint for the sky—
Where the sunrise will be;
A stroke for a gull,
A sweep for the main;
The skill to do more,
With the will to refrain.

OUT FOR A "SOLID WEST"

The Coming Political Battle of the Nonpartisan League

By A. B. GILBERT
[ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE NONPARTISAN LEADER]

The political aspirations of the new western interpolitical organization operating in the western states in both great political parties, made up of farmers and industrial labor, seeks to dominate state and national politics, in its fight built upon "the farmers' and workers' demand for Justice," against "a few monopolistic and wasteful forms of business."

SO far from being a dying proposition, the Nonpartisan League is very much alive and the old line politicians have to face the strong prospect of a "solid West," built on the farmers' and workers' demands for justice. League organization is going forward among the farmers of Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, Minnesota, Idaho, North Dakota and Montana. This political battle has attracted nation-wide attention, not only because the West is closely associated with the East in these twentieth century days, but because there is nothing to prevent a "solid West" from running over into the big agricultural states of the East. Organizations independent of the League but with similar objectives are in fact now trying to function in New York and Maine. There is a strong probability that these western farmers will unite with organized labor throughout the nation to give the bi-partisan politicians a fierce political battle in 1920.

The political situation in Minnesota is one of especial interest, because more than half of the population of the state are employed in mining, manufacturing, and mercantile pursuits. Less than 43 per cent are farmers. From the League point of view, therefore, it was a difficult state, but it so happens that Minnesota is the headquarters of the big special interests which the farmers of the Northwest had organized to overthrow. In Minneapolis

and St. Paul is the home of the grain combine, the Northwest railroads, the dominating banks, and the big insurance companies. From these two cities, North Dakota and South Dakota were ruled like subject provinces. Hence the organized farmers felt that they had to get Minnesota, no matter what the cost. After a year and a half of organizing the League had 50,000 members in the State of Minnesota and was ready to enter the primaries. Nominations were made on the Republican ticket at a joint convention of organized farmers and city workers, and on June 17th the candidates for governor received a little over 150,000 out of 348,000 Republican votes cast. The other state candidates received smaller votes, but the League man for the clerkship of the supreme court, which is one of the key positions in the politics of the state, won out in a three-cornered fight. League men had not expected to get more than 130,000 votes, and had considered that this would be enough to nominate, but the unusual issues involved brought out a record vote and put at least 50,000 machine Democrats into the Republican primaries, with the result that Governor Burnquist was renominated.

SWEEPING VICTORY IN NORTH DAKOTA

THE anti-League forces made a specially strong effort to win out in the North Dakota primaries on June 26th, because of the tremendous propaganda value that could be derived from having the home state of the League kick it out, but they were doomed to bitter disappointment. In spite of the fact that Governor Burnquist of Minnesota and men of national prominence hostile to the League toured the state, and the fact that large sums of money were poured in from the outside, the League swept everything before it on election day. Governor Frazier, who had been nominated in 1916 with less than 5,000 majority, was re-nominated this year by over 15,000 majority. Congressman Baer was renominated, and League men nominated for the other two congressional districts on the big party ticket. In two of the congressional districts the League men will have no oppo-

sition in November, because the Democratic aspirants did not receive sufficient votes to get legally on the ticket.

At the November elections all of our nominees for state office except the superintendent of public instruction were elected. In addition the farmer-labor combination got 90 per cent of the lower house of the legislature, about as large a percentage of the state senate, all three congressmen, and the place on the supreme court to be filled.

On September 3d the League and organized labor carried six state offices on the Democratic ticket in the state primaries of Idaho. They nominated candidates for the other two state offices, the state treasurer and superintendent of public instruction, on the Republican ticket without a contest. The major nominations were made on the Democratic ticket in Idaho because the Democratic party happened to be the dominant party there; whereas in North Dakota the League nominations are on the Republican ticket. Furthermore the League nominated J. F. Nugent for short-term senator, Senator Wm. E. Borah (without contest), and candidates in the two Idaho congressional districts. These splendid primary results gave rise to the hope that Idaho would parallel the course of North Dakota but the general election turned out less favorably. The League has to be content with two state officers, the state treasurer and the superintendent of public instruction, the two federal senators, and a good number of state legislators.

INDEPENDENTS, IN SOUTH DAKOTA

THE League feels that it should have South Dakota in the ranks for the same reasons that it has North Dakota. The two states are very much alike, both being predominantly agricultural, and the farmer organization has been especially successful there. But for special local reasons it was decided not to enter the South Dakota primaries. All the League members and sympathizers stayed away, from the polls, and as a consequence the primaries in June were a farce. Later the League and or-

ganized labor of South Dakota nominated independent candidates, which go on the ballot by petition. The League is thus an independent in this state, partly independent in Minnesota, true blue Republican in North Dakota, staunchly Democratic in Idaho, and of mixed complexion in other states. It is a strange animal which the bi-partisan politicians do not know how to handle. They could put up a strong fight against an independent party, but they have not yet devised any means of preventing the League from taking what they consider their own party away from them.

In Montana the League secured one of the two state offices voted on, that of associate justice of the supreme court, and it may have also a membership on the railroad commission. The League will have a good block of representatives in this state. In Nebraska, a partly organized state, the League will have at least 7 assemblymen and 2 senators, probably more. It also is probably responsible for the re-election of Senator Norris and for the defeat of a League-hating governor. In Colorado there will be a small block of League legislators.

How shall these 1918 results be considered? The League has secured a good deal less than it aimed at. On the other hand the more sweeping victory in North Dakota and the results in the other states are all gains over 1916. More than this the League idea has been effectively advertised in every nook and corner of the West. Labor has been waked up to the possibilities of the combination. The League and labor association leads the opposition to the successful party in three big states—Minnesota, South Dakota, and Idaho. In Montana it is the opposition to the Copper trust and the interests allied with it which rule both old parties. Surely this development work and the election results secured speak well for less than two years of work!

THE DISLOYALTY CHARGES CALLED CAMOUFLAGE

THE Nonpartisan League, no matter how loyal its leaders or the trend of its platform, could not have possibly escaped the charge of disloyalty in these times. The opposi-

tion to the League is economic, with the popular arguments on the League side; consequently superficial issues were needed. Before the war the opposition talked of the evils of extreme socialism and of personalities; the war added to these the so-called "loyalty" issue.

The simple facts are: that from the time Congress voted for the declaration of war on Germany, the League has supported this as the decision of the American people, in speeches, resolutions, and literature; that the League has been a great factor in bringing the many different nationalities of the Northwest to the better support of the president where the strong arm methods of self-styled patriots unopposed would have produced sullenness and hate; that the federal government through its post office and its thousands of special agents has never questioned any of the League literature or speeches. The indictments of which so much has been press agented, were all the work of county officials dominated by the interests higher up. Five have been thrown out even by the lower court, one by the Minnesota supreme court, and three League men convicted in county courts in Minnesota have been out on small bail until their cases can reach the supreme court this fall.

If the many steps toward stringent state regulation and government operation which the federal government has taken are considered as contributing to our war efficiency, the League is deserving of special praise in that it has contributed greatly to the public support of these measures. It was ahead of the government action in advising and working for them. If we have to make a choice between those who are for and against these new departures, patriotic Americans must side with the League because the President has turned his steps in the direction of the League counsel.

THE OPPOSITION LINE-UP

CONVENTIONAL party politicians regard the League, of course, as a poison, but they merely reflect more powerful interests. The League attacks certain long established business interests, what we call vested interests for

short, and they have to defend themselves. Although the League is aiming only at a few special monopolistic or wasteful forms of business, these are able somehow to persuade nearly all the business men of the Northwest that they also are in danger and have a common enemy in the League. Why an independent manufacturer or retailer should develop this attitude is hard for the League man to understand, for they like the farmer are hit by monopoly; yet such is the present fact. The antagonism to the League is just as strong in many of the small towns (perhaps it is more so because it is more personal) as in the big cities; yet their merchants and professional men live almost entirely out of the returns the farmer gets for his products. Perhaps small town leaders hate to see their domination of the surrounding country passing away. With few exceptions the commercial clubs, trade associations, traveling salesmen, and specially formed organizations such as the America First Association in Minnesota or the now defunct Goo-Goo (Good Government) League in North Dakota keep up a steady drum fire of opposition. Only occasional individuals in the towns outside the ranks of labor are friendly.

In Minnesota the League's demand for a tonnage tax on all ore shipped out of the mines, brings the great Steel Trust which owns over 80 per cent of the merchantable iron ore in the state, into the lists. The big grain traders and millers are fighting to maintain their present status without state competition or further state interference, and those marketing other farm products such as the meat packers are in the same boat. The city utility corporations fear the new movement will strengthen unionism in the cities and the elements working for city ownership.

How desperate these interests regard the situation may be judged from the fact that when it looked as though the League would capture Minnesota in the primaries a veritable reign of terror against the organized farmers was let loose. League men were kidnapped, illegally deported from towns, arrested on false charges, and treated to tar and feathers. In 19 of the 82 Minnesota counties, subservient county offi-

cials arbitrarily forbade all League meetings. League sympathizers got threats, in one case the tar and feathers, and in a great many cases the yellow paint. The hardware store of the recent League and labor candidate for governor, for instance, at Tracy, Minnesota, was painted yellow because on one occasion he dared to address a speakerless meeting of League members. In Rock county, Minnesota, a self-appointed committee deported League farmers across the Iowa line because they refused to repudiate the League.

The opposition carried the primaries with the help of these methods, but they have placed themselves in a damaging position for future contests. The public conscience of many of our people may not be clear on questions of monopoly, rural credits, or state hail insurance but it would be hard to find a plain citizen in the Northwest whose mind is not clear on law and order. The news of the outrages permitted to carry the primaries, is getting around and the whole force of the pre-primary arrests was lost to the opposition when the Supreme Court of the state threw out the indictments against President Townley and Mr. Joseph Gilbert, general manager, for distributing alleged seditious literature.

In Iowa, where the League has gotten a good foothold, the usual opposition forces are augmented by a strong organization of cement manufacturers and road contractors that has been fighting with the farmers there for years. The fear of this organization is that the League may so strengthen the farmers politically as to enable them to win out. Powerful influences have been brought to bear to give Iowa rural cement roads chiefly at the farmer's expense. The direct hostilities against the League were under the command of the Greater Iowa Association and to a less extent the Iowa Defense Council. Until magnified by this League fight, the Greater Iowa Association was little more than a rich man's mutual admiration society. The man who promoted it about 4 years ago and thereby got a good job, collected $100 apiece from Iowa rich men and contributing memberships ranging from

$10 a year to $3 from whoever would join. It has a bad record for undemocratic activity and maintains a corps of anti-League lecturers, an anti-League press service, and distributes tons of literature on the subject. But here again as in North Dakota the League is fortunate in its enemies. The mob violence and opposition to farmers in general stirred up by this propaganda has thrown into the League ranks the Iowa Homestead, a farm paper which goes to every other farm home in Iowa and has a subscription list of over 150,000. This paper is now boosting for the League as the only way back to fair play, law and order in Iowa. Its editor, being a man of some means, has publicly offered to help defend every victim of threats and mob violence in Iowa who needs his help with legal talent and publicity.

THE ORIGIN OF THE LEAGUE

THREE and a half years ago this organization of farmers, which now has a "solid" political West well under way, did not exist. Three years ago this September it published the first issue of its official weekly organ, the *Nonpartisan Leader*. On February 3, 1915, Mr. A. C. Townley, a young farmer of Beach, North Dakota, secured the first member of the League. For several years prior to that time the farmers of North Dakota had been fighting to escape the domination of their grain market and their state politics by the grain interests centered in Minneapolis. In those days before the governor and legislature of North Dakota could do anything important, they had to get the approval of Alec. McKenzie, who handled the politics for the grain interests and the utility corporations from his headquarters in the Twin Cities. First the farmers tried co-operation and could do but little with it because the state laws discouraged co-operative enterprise and because state laws and state officials permitted grossly unfair competition with their co-operative elevators. Then the farmers demanded state-owned terminal elevators and mills; they not only wanted a fair market, but they wanted the mill

by-products kept within the state for stock use so that they could develop diversified farming. At two different elections the people of North Dakota adopted this measure by a four to one referendum vote, and each time the special interests in the legislature were able to thwart the expressed will of the people. Finally, when a special delegation of farmers went to the capitol to stir up action, they were not only turned down but were grossly insulted by the House leader with the words "Go home and slop your hogs; the farmer has no business in politics; leave the politics to us." This stupid political blunder set all North Dakota afire. The politicians had overplayed their hand. They had put bitter resentment into the hearts of the common people of North Dakota and an irresistible slogan in the mouths of the little group of reformers led by A. C. Townley. "We will fill the state offices and the legislature with hog sloppers"—became the strong selling point of the League organizers.

A prospective legislative program was drawn up and organizers scurried over the state getting the signatures for this program and $6.00 from each farmer to pay for the cost of organizing, getting out a paper, and putting on a campaign. Later the dues were raised to $9.00, because it soon became evident that $6.00 would not be sufficient to put over a rousing campaign. The dues are now $8.00 a year or $16.00 for the two campaign years. For several months the League worked in secret and not until it had 23,000 members did it dare to issue a paper. The movement was then too strong to be killed off by high-handed methods. When the League first came into the open, the North Dakota politicians attempted to laugh it to death as another foolish rube idea, but the ridicule did not produce the desired result; it was too much in line with the appellation of "hog sloppers" which the League had made its own. On Washington's Birthday in 1916 the League members met at their voting precincts and nominated county delegates. Later these county delegates held county conventions and nominated men for the legislature. Later still there was the big state convention at which the farmer delegates from the

county conventions chose men to run for state offices. At the primaries on June 26, 1916, the Nonpartisan League dealt its first big blow to the anti-farmer interests. Mr. Lynn J. Frazier, a farmer who had never held political office, captured the Republican nomination for governor, and all the other Republican nominations, with the exception of state treasurer, fell into the League basket. It secured a nomination for the state treasurer's office on the Democratic ticket to appease the Democratic League members.

THE LEAGUE PROGRAM

AT the November 1916 election the League secured all of the state offices but that of state treasurer, which it missed by about 250 votes because the farmers lost track of their lone candidate on the Democratic ticket, 81 of the 113 members of the assembly, and 18 of the 25 senators to be elected. The League also secured all three judgeships of the state supreme court. A good indication by the way of how the League contributes to party independence is furnished by this election. Mr. Frazier, on the Republican ticket, carried the state by a vote of 87,665 to 20,351 for his opponent, and yet North Dakota went to President Wilson by 1,735. The results of this victory and the lesson it contained spread quickly, of course, to the neighboring states. These other farmers made up their minds that the League had the right solution to their problems, and the North Dakota Nonpartisan League became the National Nonpartisan League, working at the present time in thirteen states.

In each state the League has a different program, because the problems to be met are different. The North Dakota farmer is concerned chiefly with the grain market and the development of diversified farming. The Idaho farmer has big marketing problems—and the water power and lumber interests to deal with. In Colorado and Texas, for instance, there is beet sugar, irrigation, and the holding of land out of use. The one big plank of common interest in all the states is the reform of our marketing system, which nearly every-

one in these days admits needs a lot of reforming, but on which there is a vast amount of disagreement as to methods. The League proposes to reform the system by government ownership of the marketing facilities, such as warehouses, cold storage plants, and packing houses, and of transportation. In the resolutions passed by their several conventions, the League farmers have also demanded national ownership of the basic national resources, such as iron, coal, oil, and copper. They are backing up the Federal Farm Loan Bank and demanding state rural credit banks operated at cost, to give the farmer credit facilities as good as the city business men now enjoy—something which private rural banks have scarcely even pretended to do. The object is to add to rather than supplant our present banking system. Another common plank is that demanding the exemption of farm improvements from taxation.

This plank and those which substitute state ownership for the long tried policy of regulating monopolies afford the opposition one of their principal means of attack. It is the old trick, attempted against every reform movement, of dubbing it one of extreme Socialism or single tax, or both, and the more advanced of the opposition do not hesitate to tack on I. W. W. A fulsome account of the evils of extreme Socialism and reports of the Russian Bolsheviki then complete the argument. The solid farmers of the West obviously are not Socialists, nor are they members of the much criticized Industrial Workers of the World. They are property owners who believe that regulation of monopolies has failed and who believe that the state ownership of the things they have mentioned in their program will be good business for themselves and the rest of the common people. History shows that these farmers were the first to force regulation of monopoly upon the United States through their Grange and Alliance movements, and now that they believe this has failed, they are the first to try the only way out that is left, through their Nonpartisan League. To fight monopoly is not a new, radical step but a defense of long established American traditions of equal opportunity or fair play for all.

THE AIMS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Some of the Problems that Our Legislators Must Grapple

By HON. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN
[U. S. SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS]

(An Interview With the Forum)

WHILE the aims of the Republican purposes in National legislation of the next Congress have been fairly well outlined, and while the expectations of the Republican party have been properly exalted to hope for the best, it will be impossible to make any radical changes in the existing embarrassments within less than a year. The obligations by appropriation which the present Administration has incurred, must be fulfilled. All existing contracts, taxes, administrative promises made under democratic interpretation of war measures, will have to be fulfilled. There is no relief that can be given immediately, but there will be obvious evidences of rescue work in the forthcoming Congress.

Government ownership dragged from the inner faith of socialism is an unpopular creed, but having been adopted by the powerful opportunity which the war has given the present Administration it will be difficult to disturb the feast. It is not the intention or the sentiment of the Republican party to spoil any legitimate festivities. We do not wish to dampen the ardor of the celebration of our great victory, but it will be necessary, in accord with Republican policies to suggest an economy of appetite. If the ambitions of the present administration were able to pursue their imperial course without interruption and without protest, the Nation would be reduced to the patriotic duty of working for the Government. That is what Government ownership means. For the man who has no home, and doesn't care very much about paying his debts, and has no scruples about borrowing money when he

can and where he can, Government ownership is an attractive theory. It is a very nice thing for the man who has nothing. It promises him a job, with de luxe wages, and no very great fear of being thrown out, so long as he votes satisfactorily. But to the man who has a home, a business, an embarrassing conscience about his debts and an objection to borrowing money, Government ownership is a menace.

THE PLAN AS PREPARED BY OUR FATHERS VERSUS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

AND after all, camouflaged as it is by promissory propaganda, attractive as the employment it offers seems to be, it has not occurred to those who favor Government ownership to ask the question of where the Government is to get the money to pay these magnificent wages. It has to come from somewhere, and before it is taken it has belonged to somebody. There must, therefore, be a large floating population of philanthropic rich people from whom this money must come. Under the pressure of war emergency all the dollars of all the people are at the service of the Government, of course, but having contributed sufficient to beat the Hun, why inaugurate a system of Government which only came into existence for emergency conditions.

And, in the ultimate financial adjustment of Government ownership, there is extreme difficulty in tracing the final destiny of the money involved. It seems to me that while the splendid wages given to those who are employed under the terms of Government ownership go into one pocket and are, in the course of individual obligations divided so that some of it goes into the other pocket, it does not evaporate. Is it possible that some one comes along and takes the money out of both pockets in the name of Government ownership and disappears with it?

It is a proposition which lays itself open to the discerning skill of a conjurer, and I have no such talent by which to solve the problem, but I am convinced that there was an excellent plan of Government prepared by the fathers of the Constitution, and I don't think anyone has been born since who is

capable of writing a new document for our National Government that can improve upon it.

TO COUNTERACT SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES

ONE of the chief purposes of a Republican Congress will be to counteract the ambitions of socialism, and socialistic forms of Government that have and are threatening the stability and the grandeur of this Republic. Most of the socialistic radicals who are not in jail, are at present employed by the Government, and that is not an exaggeration for a close examination of the names of Government officers in the various important official departments of the Government have been recognized socialists. But, we can accomplish nothing at the opening of this 66th Session of Congress of any drastic effect. If the President, upon his return from Europe, should see fit to call an extraordinary session of Congress, we should then have an opportunity to curtail and to accomplish certain incisions in the body politic that will remove certain obstructions in our National health. Some of the operations may be painful, some of them will be painless if the patient is properly etherized. If an extraordinary session is not called, Congress will be too occupied with the general course of business, such as demobilization, reconstruction of industries, and a general effort to restrain the forces of Government ownership, to pass any new leglislation. As a legislative body it will be the duty of Congress to ratify the executive orders of the present administration.

I look forward to extraordinary reaction of Congressional ideas when the Peace Treaty comes before Congress for ratification. The dim mystery in which that extraordinary document looms before us today, admits of conjecture that baffles the imagination of the brilliant novelist. It would be too much for a Jules Verne, for a Balzac, and I am afraid beyond the imagination of the present Administration. However, wherever it comes from, whatever it looks like, whenever it arrives, all the reason of the United States Congress will be focused upon that extraordinary document. It will

require a great strain on that reason, but we intend to be equal to it.

THEY DO MISSIONARY WORK WITH DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS

IT is, of course, with sincere regrets that the Republican Congress finds itself confronted with delays, but the task of the alienist is one of patience, and there is a duty of the unprofessional character which Congress is obliged to assume at this time, which is quite as sacred as the professional duty.

Many of us will have to assume the task of reformation. We shall have to do missionary work among our Democratic colleagues, but there are indications that that will not be so formidable as it might have been when the Republican representation was in the minority. In my association with my colleagues on the floor of the Senate, I have already observed an obvious intention among some of the leading Democrats to change their mind. A great wave of intelligence is sweeping over them which baffles some of them and refreshes others.

In the matter of reorganization of our business we cannot expect very much change of existing conditions for a while. When we find newspapers owned by Cabinet officers still advertising for many thousands of Government employees to carry on the enormous construction work for our next war—it must be our next war since our present war is over—when we find beautiful macadam roads being industriously built at the expense of the Government, when we find well equipped railroads being built, attractive bungalow villages being constructed, all at the expense of Government money, we naturally wonder what secret information the administration may have of the next war, for, if I am wrong, if the habit of conjecture has disturbed my reason and there is no next war, why are we doing these things?

This particular bit of construction which I am talking about is not far from Raleigh, N. C., a Southern State sufficiently remote from the seat of war in Washngton to be tolerably safe since peace is in the air. It is possible that this beautiful spot newly equipped for the most modern comfort of

factory life, will be a delightful place for a manufactory of any kind. There it is, all ready to be organized.

THE SALVAGE OF WAR INDUSTRY

THE large industries that were taken over for the emergency of the war by the Government are still industriously making cannon, and shells, and arms of all sorts for the next war. Whether we are to become a belligerent nation under the pressure of this fast accumulating ammunition of course I can not say. I do not quite understand why we are using valuable steel, filling it with powder, and piling it up ready to kill somebody with. This wastage of steel is a very serious interference with steel construction. If the excuse is made that it would be unsafe to release the great number of Government employees who are working in these industries at once, and that they must therefore be kept at work, I would much rather see the steel saved than the possible menace of labor difficulties. There is no reason in the world why the Government should stop the pay envelopes of these people. They could still keep them on the pay roll and save the steel. What are we going to do with all these steel shells piled up mountain high? There is no possible chance of salvaging a loaded steel shell. We have simply got to fire them to get rid of them. Who are we going to kill? That may be a question that the Republican Congress will have to answer.

One thing is quite clear that if the splendid achievements of our great business captains in this country are to be surrendered to the policy of Government ownership, there won't be much left for the business man to do. He'll have to put on jumpers and go to work for the Government, and sleep in the pretty bungalows that are being constructed for him whether he likes bungalows or not, and he will have to fill his little dinner pail with a Food Administration bill of fare. Traveling will not be encouraged. He will probably have to punch a time clock which will not give him an opportunity to catch a train.

THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS AND THE PEACE TREATY

WHILE all this is presented in an apparent form of levity, it is an actual possibility which only seems ridiculous by contrast with the principles of this republic. There are many things which have happened since the war ended that are unexpectedly absurd. I do not know whether the Republican party is interested in the proposed League of Nations, I know that they fail to see the possibility of a World of Republics with possibly an Imperial Chief President of the Republics of the World. Imagination topples at the thought. It is possible that a League of Nations might transpire, organized upon the basic principles of the United States, that is by preserving the independence of National boundaries operating as our states do and retaining local control of their National affairs. I cannot conceive how we can welcome the Turk with his Mohammedan faith as an equal with our own enlightened Republic. There are some strange human outbursts of tradition in Europe among the various European races, and how we are going to melt them down by the magic words of administrative authority I don't know. I have yet to see or to hear that wonderful man whose magic voice shall make the Lion and the Lamb lie down together. The character of the problem which this coming Peace Treaty is about to solve, is something like the nature of a miracle. There is no one yet since the days of the New Testament who can walk on the waters, or who can perform the great miracle of sacred history.

We shall see, and since we have a Republican Congress, we shall see well before we sign. There will be no dim light hanging over the legislative halls when the Peace Treaty reaches us for final ratification. We shall have our spectacles on, we shall look for every dot on the i, for every comma and we shall put the periods in ourselves.

DISTRUSTS GERMANY—WANTS NEW CONGRESSIONAL RULES

IT is impossible to see the issues of foreign trade, but there is one country which I believe should be shut out of the markets of the world, and that is Germany. I should personally greatly object to see Germans selling their goods or buying goods in an open market in this country, because I would know that every dollar they took out would be spent in creating another war against us. Germany should not be permitted to make blood money out of us.

There are conditions in our existing National Laws which should be changed. One of them is the rules and regulations that govern Congressional action. The position in which the American people are left through the adjournment of Congress suddenly, is one of helplessness. Between the time of the adjournment on November 21st, and the reconvening of Congress on December 2nd the entire power of the events of the nation are in the hands of the Executive office of the Nation. His power is vast, unbelievable to the people themselves. During the interval anything might happen, and the only resource of action for the people of the United States would not rest with their representative in Washington but with the President alone and by himself. The vote of Congress against adjournment was in the minority, and consequently the adjournment was taken. In England such a situation is impossible. It is only possible under a monarchy anywhere in the world excepting in the United States. This will be one of the problems which the Republican Congress will no doubt consider.

THE RED FLAG OF BOLSHEVISM

The Spreading Disease of Anarchy that Is World Wide

By HON. JAMES A. REED
[U. S. SENATOR FROM MISSOURI]

REVOLUTION is always dangerous. From autocracy to anarchy—such is the swing of the pendulum. No race ever tamely submitted to physical slavery unless it had also been placed in intellectual bondage. An oppressed people is likely to regard any law as an instrument of tyranny. Accordingly, they arrive at the conclusion that all law must be destroyed in order that liberty may be attained It follows that an ignorant and oppressed people in the first stages of revolutionary fervor, usually substitute the power of the mob for the tyranny of the autocrat; whereupon, there ensues a period of bloody terrorism out of which emerges a new despotism. This is but an epitome of the world's history. Countless rebellions have succeeded. For a day the people have dreamed of liberty only to find their chains more firmly riveted than before.

Excepting, of course, the case of conquered races held in subjection by superior forces, I repeat that every despotism presupposes intellectual serfdom. Men who are capable of appreciating freedom, never submit to any great degree of oppression.

The American Colonist rebelled because of a tax in itself inconsequential. They asserted their rights as Englishmen. They refused to permit any impairment of their just privileges. Such a people, believing in constitutions, appreciating liberty, knowing that freedom is the blossom and fruit of the law, were capable of establishing a stable government. It was to be a government of law created by a free people for their own control. To this law they gave a willing obedience. They recognized the fact that without law no

right can be secure, and that where rights are not secure there is no liberty.

STARVATION AND ANARCHY STALKING ACROSS EUROPE

THE Fathers of the Republic occupied a position of rare advantage. They had inherited their liberties. A long line of ancestors stubbornly resisting oppression, had wrung from the Kings of England the Magna Charta and established the principles of common law. They had, therefore, become schooled in the science of government. They understood the fundamental structure of a free state. I but repeat what has often gone unchallenged, that in all the history of the world there never was gathered in one assembly a body of men so skilled in knowledge of history, of statecraft, and of government, as the Continental Congress. Their greatness and understanding were typical of those they represented.

These observations may serve some purpose in considering events now crowding upon the world's stage. The carnage of war has scarce ceased. Through the smoke that is just lifting there can be seen two sinister figures—starvation and anarchy—stalking across the battle fields of Europe. The erstwhile soldiers of autocracy now march beneath the red flag. Kings are being tumbled from their thrones. Mobs riot in a dozen capitals. Anarchy prevails.

Some of these conditions—natural concomitants of war—are not surprising. They come in the natural course of things, and under ordinary conditions would give way to some form of organized government which might or might not bring to the common people a greater measure of liberty.

The astonishing, the sinister fact exposed by the European conflict is that the doctrines of anarchy have taken root in every country of the world. For years they have been secretly taught. The evil seed has fallen upon the fruitful soil of ignorance and criminality. The extent of this propaganda and its marvelous secrecy are difficult of comprehension. With an almost diabolic skill it played upon the

prejudices, hopes, and fears of vast numbers of people. To the unlettered Russian peasant, whose back had long bled beneath the lash, it promised freedom from the blows of oppressors; freedom from all the restrictions of law. It held before his dazzled vision promise of wealth without labor.

It was therefore not surprising that a people long oppressed could, by rapid processes, be led to the overthrow of their rulers, then to their murder, then to the betrayal of confederates and friends, and finally to a state of anarchy in which the cruelty of the mob has surpassed the tyranny of the Romanoffs.

ANARCHISTIC DOCTRINES THAT THREATEN AMERICA, DEFINED

IT further appears that this doctrine has its adherents in every part of Germany and Austria; that its ramifications extend into all European countries, and that there is even in our own land an astonishing number of men who, existing under the guise of various organizations, accept in the main doctrines that are entirely or partially anarchistic.

The I. W. Ws. deny the force of all law and have plotted the destruction of property in nearly every western state. This organization assumes a more serious and mischievous aspect when we consider it in connection with its kindred organizations in other countries.

It is not too much to say that a world conspiracy, looking to the overthrow of all governments, has been in process of formation for many years. To disregard these plain facts is not the part of wisdom. The magnitude of the movement can only be appreciated when we consider that many organizations and societies go far enough to advocate doctrines which tend to the destruction of law, yet do not boldly announce that as their ultimate end. Indeed, some of them are undoubtedly ignorant of the inevitable logic of their teachings. It may be useful to review a few of these dangerous doctrines.

It is asserted by some that the title to all property should be vested in the state. This is only a polite method of stating that the property of citizens should be confiscated.

It is claimed by others that the citizen should perform such duties as are prescribed by state. This in its last analysis makes of every citizen a slave, for each man is thereby obliged to do that which he is ordered to do by some other man.

It is argued by those of a milder persuasion that the government should control and regulate all important properties in the land. (I do not here speak of public utilities, which lie in a class by themselves.) But this doctrine, if ever established, will finally lead to public control and ownership of all property, i. e., the abolition of all property rights.

The advocates of these theories apparently do not understand that the establishment of any one of them destroys the very thing we call liberty, for liberty consists in the right to life, in the right to choose one's vocation, and in the right to toil and to keep that which has been produced. In a word, to move freely about the world; to possess and enjoy property.

AMERICAN DEMAGOGUES WHO ASSIST BOLSHEVISM

THERE is another class of "assistant Bolsheviki," which deserves special attention. I refer to those numerous and noisy agitators who for years have gone about undermining the respect and reverence of our people for law and for the institutions of government.

At the very head of this list I class those who in recent years have indiscriminately denounced the courts of our land. Reference is not here made to men who have properly pointed out abuses by individual courts of judges. I am speaking of that agitation for years carried on by aspiring demagogues, which among other heresies proposed a referendum vote upon the judgments of courts. That is to say, they declared that for the law of the land, construed by a court, should be substituted the opinion of a majority unregulated by any rule and responding only to the impulse of the hour. The Bolsheviki have not gone further than to suggest that the country shall be ruled by the opinion of the

mob, unguided by law and unchecked by constitution. At this point they touch hands with certain American publicists and politicians of great repute.

A part of the propaganda referred to found expression in denunciations of the precedents of courts. The advocates of this "reform" forget that the rule of precedent is only the rule of law, and that if precedents be ignored there will be substituted for them the opinion of the individual who happens at the moment to be acting as judge. Thus instead of a government of law we would have a government by petty tyrants known as judges, who would rule in accordance with their own will, and that is the very essence of despotism. In a word, we would have no law. The advocates of the insidious doctrine I am discussing are but a step removed from the Bolsheviki of Russia. And yet, they found so many followers in this country that they were able to write their principles into the platform of a great political party.

Recently these reformers have taken up the advocacy of another doctrine almost equally destructive. They insist that no court should ever be permitted to declare an act of a State Legislature, or an act of Congress, unconstitutional. They fail to comprehend that the establishment of such a doctrine works the annihilation of the federal and of all state constitutions. This results because if a state legislature, or the Congress, can pass a law in defiance of the Constitution, and no court is permitted to declare the supremacy of the Constitution over the statute, the statute becomes the law of the land. Thus the Constitution is wiped out.

THE ATTEMPT TO DESTROY STATE'S RIGHTS

THE Constitution of the United States might therefore be abrogated at any session of Congress, by the simple process of passing statutes in its teeth. Likewise, the Constitutions of the respective states could be similarly repealed or abrogated at any session of a state legislature.

If this rule were to be adopted any state legislature could

pass a law denying the right to trial by jury. Thereupon a citizen might be haled before any judge, denied the right to a jury of his peers, and sentenced to execution. An appeal to the Constitution of the United States would be answered by the statement that "no court is possessed of the right to declare an act of the legislature, or the proceeding thereunder, unconstitutional."

This vicious doctrine, utterly destructive of the Constitution, has been advocated in high places. Its protagonists manifestly fail to see that they propose the destruction of the Charter of the people's liberty. They evidently do not understand that when the people formed the Federal Government, and the governments of the respective states, they, the people, reserved to themselves certain rights which were deemed essential to their liberties, and that they declared these rights should never be taken away without their express consent, manifested in the manner and form provided for in the charters of their liberties. They fail to see that the proposition to make legislative and congressional acts superior to the Constitution places it in the power of the Legislature and the Congress to destroy all the Constitutional rights thus solemnly reserved by the people themselves. Stated differently, these reformers close their eyes to the fact that the doctrine they propose strikes at the basis of Constitutional liberty; that it makes legislative bodies supreme and empowers them to act without limitation of any kind. It places within a legislative majority the power to abolish the very form of our government, and to substitute an autocracy for our democracy.

When such doctrines as these are preached from exalted places, it is not to be marvelled at that the oppressed of other lands may, in blundering through the twilight of their ignorance follow the lurid glare of the red flag or weltering in bloody reprisals and revenges, imagine they enjoy the blessings of liberty.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE COURTS, THE PEOPLE'S SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY

I COULD discuss many other false doctrines, alike destructive of laws, respect for courts, and reverence for constitutions. Perhaps enough has been said to suggest a final thought. At this tragic period of the world's history the business of all friends of liberty is to hold fast to the Constitution; to uphold the dignity of our courts, and to teach a fact too seldom dwelt upon—that constitutions are the charters of the people's liberties, to which they should cling as did the ancient refugee to the horns of the altar. We should remember that courts, although sometimes imperfect, are the only citadels within which the individual can find a refuge from private wrong or official oppression.

At a time like this we should be slow in changing any of the old principles of our government, however imperfect they may seem to some. Let it not be forgotten that they have withstood the storms of adversity and vicissitudes of fortune for 142 years. Let us abide in the faith that those rules of law and forms of government under which we have grown to be the most puissant nation on earth may be with safety tolerated yet a little while longer. It is our high duty just now to furnish to the world evidence of the stability of our institutions. Cannot the impatience of those who desire radical experiment abide the day when the world shall have settled back into a condition of sanity, when Europe's reconstruction may have been accomplished, and when our people, in the calm after light of contemplation may review the earth's tragedy and by its lessons and our own experience judge what should be our future course?

THE THEATRE IN REVIEW

By C. COURTENAY SAVAGE

New York's Special Victory Matinee

HAD any theatrical producer ended his play with a climax as dramatically sudden as the cessation of war hostilities, the critics would have cried "Machine-made" and condemned the play as unnatural. Which proves once again that everyday existence is frequently too theatrical for the stage.

There was nothing mechanical about the twin pageants —one false and one real—that marked the armistice. More than one producer must have studied the effect of spontaneous joy on the heart of the mob. Never in the history of the world has King Carnival reigned as supreme as he did during the nation-wide celebration of the beginning of peace. From the swinging doors of great office buildings, from the lobbies of hotels, from homes of every description, the choristers of the biggest chorus number that the world ever staged, rushed out to the streets, a song on their lips, their feet tingling to unheard dance music—flowers, flags, and confetti adding to the colorful scene.

The biggest city of the country presented some odd sights that Monday—not the least amazing of them being the ballyhoo who announced to the passing merrymakers that a Broadway success was giving a special Victory Matinee. At least three of the theatres gave special performance to crowded houses, and that night the standees cheered to the last echo the anthems of the Allies as they were played between acts.

What the abrupt ending of hostilities means to the theatrical world is a question. Several managers with war plays in preparation have decided to go on with their plans, while others are quickly changing the theme of their offerings. At least one current success—a play which centers on

the purchase of a wireless gun, is advertised as "not a war play"—while it is certain that the continuing of the conflict would have caused the military theme of the melodrama to be featured.

This play, "The Long Dash," is from the joint authorship of Victor Mapes and Robert M. Mackay. In addition to the novelty of a demonstration of a gun which aims, loads and fires itself by wireless—the play has a cast of unusual excellence. Robert Edeson has the dual role of two brothers, one a profiteer, the other a loyal and lovable American. On the physical resemblance of the two men hinges the climax of the story, and Mr. Edeson, with the splendid skill he possesses, makes each characterization distinct. Another noteworthy performance is given by Mr. Henry E. Dixey, who is a suave and subtle spy. Mr. Dixey also has a dual role, for he masquerades as an electrician in order to witness the demonstration of the wireless gun. "The Long Dash" is frankly reminiscent of the ten-twenty-thirty cent plays of the olden days. It is as exciting, and being well acted and well staged, has all the elements of continued success.

The War as "the big chance"

"THE BIG CHANCE" is a war drama of awakening souls. As *Mary* expresses it, "God turned back the clock, and gave men who never had a chance to live decently —a chance to find a decent death." Mary is the mistress of one man and the idol of several others—a typical group of worthless New Yorkers—*Larry,* the remittance man from Ireland; *Eddie,* the pool-room hanger-on, and *"Pinkey"* a millionaire's son with a love for fast cars and blonde ladies. Her lover is a weak-charactered boy from New Bedford, who has brought Mary from his own mill in that town. The first act is laid at the time of the sinking of the Lusitania, and the second, occurring a year later, finds the girl awakened to the chance of self-reformation that the war offers. Her lover is in jail for forgery, but with impassioned appeal that it is their chance to make good, she sends the three men hurrying to Canada and enlistment. The story progresses

to an emotional climax in a regimental dugout, and proves to be one of the most dramatic offerings of the war. Even the cessation of hostilities should not hinder its success. The acting of the play is of the "all star" variety. Willard Mack, who is the author, plays the leading male role, the Irishman; Mary Nash gives a commanding performance as *Mary,* while William E. Meehan is the boy from the pool-rooms. They are an unforgettable trio. John Mason is also in the cast, as well as several other players of ability.

Playwrights in Varying Moods

IT is seldom that a playwright is able to keep an audience laughing for three acts and still hold them on the verge of tears. That is what Clare Kummer has done in "Be Calm Camilla," and it is that novel sensation which will make people wish to sit through the gossamer-like comedy a second time. "Be Calm Camilla" is feather-down. Its story is of a girl who finds her illusions shattered by a city, but who finds that the dwellers of the city are all anxious to protect her against herself. The waiter at the cheap hotel smuggles her food, the Broadway song writer offers her marriage, even the men who come to take the piano she cannot pay for, go away saying that they will report she is not at home. Still she persists that she is a woman of the world. What action there is in the comedy comes through her love for a man whose automobile runs her down as she wanders half-starved through the streets. He is kind to her, lavish with money in order to heal her physical injuries—and she wants his love. In the end, of course, she gets it. But by that time the audience has witnessed one of the most charming comedies that Miss Kummer has written, and the splendid acting of Miss Lola Fisher, surrounded by a cast of real players. "Be Calm Camilla" is a fairy story for grown-ups. My sympathy goes to those who will not enjoy this comedy, for something of the never, never land is gone from their hearts.

Bertha Kalish has so definitely impressed her personality upon theatre-goers that one knows exactly what to expect of her in highly emotional roles. One might well wish

for something more modern than the Danish, old world setting, of " The Riddle-Woman," yet it serves to give Mme. Kalish an opportunity to display her art. *The Riddle-Woman* is the wife of a great merchant. Yet in spite of her place in society there is mystery hidden in her pale beauty. Among her circle of friends is *Count Helsinger,* a gambler and blackmailer. He is a male vampire, and *The Riddle-Woman* is one of his victims. Her struggle with this man, physical as well as mental, and her fear of losing her husband's affection gives the play its action, and allows for several emotional characterizations. The writing of the play is "old school," but its acting value is good. A. E. Anson is a villain of high order, while the rest of the cast is notable both for the names of the players, and their individual work. Mme. Kalish has devoted most of her time to the motion picture of late seasons. It is to be hoped that some manager will find her a thoroughly modern play, that will bring out all the charm of her impersonations. In the meantime Mme. Kalish and " The Riddle-Woman " are admirable.

The world runs to a novelty and so it will hasten to Maeterlinck's " The Betrothal," a sequel to " The Blue Bird," presented by Winthrop Ames. In " The Betrothal " Maeterlinck plays upon the fancy that the good, bad, or indifferent ancestors, working upon the present generation as a medium, project their tendencies into unborn impulses (children), and whether we will or no, points out our mates by the forces of intuition, the silent propulsion of heredity. It is a pretty theme as pictured on the stage in flesh and blood—and fairy lore.

The slight plot tells of Tyltyl, hero of " The Blue Bird," grown to seventeen, and in search of his dream maiden. Most of the other characters of " The Blue Bird " appear again, and serve as vehicles for much trite, but commonly accepted, philosophy bearing upon cause, effect, human facilities and motives. " The Betrothal " offers a palatable evening for the romance in us all. Everyone will want to sit in the chrome of Maeterlinck's fancy and enjoy the whimsical play of lights, magic and dance.

In the Land of Song and Dance

GLORIANNA has two things that cannot be found in every musical comedy. One is the truly operatic voice of Eleanor Painter, who is the star of the new musical play, the other is the very splendid dancing of a half dozen members of the cast. The story of "Glorianna" will be reminiscent to many playgoers, for Mrs. Cushing, the author, has re-written her play, "A Widow by Proxy," and allowed the action to stop long enough for the introduction of music. The story is not hilariously funny, but it holds the interest, and, as seems to be the fashion in musical comedy this season, does not get lost in the second act. The music of "Glorianna" is interesting, and several of the tunes are of the popular variety that makes them remembered after the fall of the final curtain. Miss Painter, who has divided her time between the concert and the legitimate stage for the past few seasons, is welcomed back in light opera. She has a charming voice, and can act. The dancing is of sufficient quality to make any musical comedy a success.

Another new musical play is "Little Simplicity," which has been playing in the smaller cities since early fall, awaiting an opportunity to give a metropolitan showing. This musical comedy of rather conventional style is carried to success by the novelty of its last act setting, a Y. M. C. A. hut in France—with the whole cast in khaki, canteen costumes, or turned entertainers for the fighting men. The action starts in a Tunis cafe, goes to the Latin Quartier, Paris, and then to the front, with considerable period of time between each act. Some of the music is pleasing, and both Carolyn Thomson and Carl Gantvoort, who play the leading roles, can sing. The honors of the performance, however, go to Marjorie Gateson, who has for several seasons been making her steady way towards popularity. She plays with vivacity the role of a cabaret performer who is thoroughly conversant with the habits of men. The choruses have a spirited dash that is refreshing, especially one of war workers which brings the last act to a climax. "Little Simplicity" will doubtless be popular.

In " Head Over Heels " Mitzi, the diminutive lady who is no bigger than her name, is herself again. " Cunning," the ladies say, " funny," according to the men, and they both might add: " The cleverest little comedienne on the stage." There is not much more to add about Mitzi in " Head Over Heels," except that she is entertainingly surrounded by clever people, and that the Book and Lyrics are by Edgar Allan Woolf, and the music by Jerome Kern, which insures a clever and tuneful evening.

The question, " Who ate the canary? " has been revived, only this time it is not a bird that has been swallowed, but a diamond of great value, the real reason for the swallowing being to provide the newest musical comedy with a title, " The Canary," and a slight plot on which to hinge its laughter, good music, dancing, and pretty girls. " The Canary " gives Joseph Cawthorn another chance to make the war-worn world laugh and grow fat. One of the really funny men of the theatre, Cawthorn is, as one of a party of girls from a select school expressed it, a " pet." The production glistens with stellar people. Julia Sanderson is herself, as usual, and therefore charming, as *Julie,* dainty and full of animation. Funny as Mr. Cawthorn is, he is greatly aided by Maude Eburne, who gives a ridiculous characterization of *Mary Ellen,* in pursuit of a husband. Sam B. Hardy, as a self-appointed pet of the ladies, displays his usual brand of humor, supplying whatever fun Mr. Cawthorn and Miss Eburne omit. James Doyle and Harlan Dixon as the dancing detectives conclude the list of players featured in the cast. Altogether " The Canary " is a perfect evening, and it will be unfortunate when we have all seen it, for then we will have to take our laughter to other shrines. Score a high mark for Mr. Dillingham who has given us the best musical comedy of the season.

A Season of Revivals

ROBERT MANTELL, who is the only portrayer of Shakespearian and romantic roles to constantly associate himself with such performances, is playing an engage-

ment in New York. For his first two weeks he offered his ever-famous "Richelieu," and followed it by a repertoire of Shakespearian plays. Mr. Mantell is a splendid actor, and his productions are directed with careful taste. Further criticisms of performances that have been famous for a score of years would be foolish, and it is to the credit of the public taste that his engagements are always popular.

Another familiar performance is Mr. David Warfield's "Auctioneer." Mr. Warfield is playing the familiar role with the same sympathetic interpretation that has delighted thousands—or would hundreds of thousands be more correct? With "The Music Master" to vary the monotony of his stage existence, Mr. Warfield need never look for a new play.

Still another play to be revived is Jean Webster's comedy, "Daddy Long Legs." This romance of the Foundling Home is still as charming as it was a few years ago, and the present production is enhanced by the performance of Mr. Henry Miller as *Jarvis Pendleton*. Ruth Chatterton is still playing *Judy*. Her work has gained in artistry since she first appeared in the familiar role. She brings out the humor in the character, as well as the delicate sentiment. The love story is refreshingly true to life, and the happy ending is welcomed by every audience, for the character is captivating. Mr. Miller gives dignity and sentiment to the role of the wealthy benefactor of the foundlings, and his emotional passages have a convincing reality that is not always to be found in plays of pure sentiment.

The Editor's Un-Easy Chair

(Contributions to this department must be addressed to the Editor and should not exceed 1,000 words. Manuscripts should contain addressed envelope stamped.)

The Days of Leveling at Hand

TOLSTOI once said that marriage was a failure to just that extent that every other human institution was a failure. It is evident that all human institutions are in the last analysis doomed to failure, because they lack the necessary reach to apply to changing and advancing conditions of life and the growth of human intelligence. We cannot anticipate with sufficient perspective, therefore we cannot organize and legislate to meet conditions yet unborn.

Out of the world war, however, has come a consciousness of the need of unification and control. In throwing down one crown we reach for another. In questioning the personal control we are reaching out for the control of law and government founded upon justice and equality by the consent of the majority of peoples.

New problems are protruding themselves with confusing rapidity and accepted principles of law and economics are becoming dead letters. What individuals may not do, properly constituted government by consent may do; but in it all we are wondering if the old enemy to peace will prevail, to wit, human greed.

Greed is a word of broad significance and comprehends many aspects, political, economic, religious, territorial, industrial, personal.

Thinking men and thinking women are aware that in the readjustment of home and international affairs conditions may not and never can revert to pre-war conditions. War necessarily has put us upon a military footing, which means general mobilization and control for a unified purpose. While in numerous ways government control has brought better conditions for war purposes, pointing to prog-

ress; in some aspects it is pregnant with danger to our very institutions.

Erected upon the foundations of liberty of speech and action, unhampered development of the competitive system, and the encouragement of foreign trade, our national industries and institutions have prospered to an amazing extent. In emergencies of war we find old conceptions of economics overturned, substituted by regulation and control, previously denied the individual.

Our national transportation, our systems of communications, our very industries under the edict, if not complete subordination of Washington, we as an industrial nation find ourselves in the grip of two organized powers: one, the elected majority in official life; the other, the self constituted majority of organized labor. In between these two clashing interests there exists, by government establishment, certain mediating boards. Will the awards of these courts be accepted? If they are repudiated by either party, industrial chaos faces the issue, government interference by confiscation, or force, follows, or industrial chaos.

Questions of Government Ownership

OUR greatest after war problem at home is the readjustment of industrial conditions. Force is at best a temporary expedient to make men complacent against their will, unless the judgment and public opinion of the majority sustains the use of force. Labor on a strike, perhaps with reason, will not, without all the protest that is within them, return to work under conditions of protest. Neither can industry survive under rulings that make profit negligible. And in the last analysis the cost of the conflict backs up upon the ultimate consumer—and the purchasing price of the dollar shrinks accordingly until its value is unstable in world markets.

Some economists who are studying our changing conditions, watching the soaring prices, the shrinking dollars, and the increasing and apparently irresistible demands of or-

ganized labor, see only one trend in the perplexing conditions: the radical change in the operation of the great "Key" industries—complete government ownership of all those vast industries that affect the fundamental necessities of life.

The cherished behalf of idealists, that government ownership is a panacea of industrial ills, is not borne out by previous examples either here or abroad. We have seen the postal system of France held up by strikes that developed violence; the railroads of the same nation thrown into the hands of soldiers, and even in our war period we have had constant strikes upon Government work. The Government, by force, may put down a strike, but only by bloodshed can it hold it down, if the workers are not appeased in their demands. The strike is the formidable weapon of Organized Labor, and does not confine itself to the restricted case in hand. It spreads into sympathetic and allied trades as rapidly as the influenza. It is man-power as potent in industry, as is armed man power in warfare.

The only difference between a strike against Government owned industry and privately owned is that in the case of the former force may be employed, or the alternative of lifting the wage scale at the expense of the consumer or tax payer. Mere government control does not solve the labor question—nor, as far as experience reveals, reduce the cost to the consumer.

So we come around the circle, back to Central control, except, under a democracy instead of an autocracy. Inspired by the ideals of war, democracy is safe, for a time, but this is the period for preparation against that time when the human equation will, as of yore, reassert itself, and idealism will, as before, be shelved.

The World's Interlocking Interests

THE governments of the world are in evolution. We are reestablishing small nations, but are recognizing the international character of every nation. Again comes the necessity of a greater control—a control by agreements,

treaties, co-relating interests—self-protection and protection against each other. Out of it all seems to come one hope, the rising tide of world consciousness and universality of a greater intelligence on the part of the peoples of all nations. How far this impulse of general uplift and educational development may prevail and be depended upon to sense questions of human rights and international comity and justice is a problem that will be constantly before us all. How to solve our domestic and international questions, and at the same time give to the workers of the world what they are seeking, looms large in the perspective. The Days of Leveling are at hand. How close may we approach each other and hold to fair values and just rights, without conflict, challenges the greatest brains and the best impulses of thoughtful and far-sighted statesmen, honest labor leaders and the peace loving public in every nation.

Uncle Sam Goes to Sea

THE basic hourly wage, for the principal skilled crafts, decided upon by the Shipbuilding Labor Adjustment Board, is eighty cents per hour. This will go into effect April first. There are still needed 200,000 men to carry out the work of the building of the mercantile marine, planned by the Shipping Board. It is proposed to continue the shipping program; to build a great Peace Fleet to capture the trade of the world, or at least such a part of it as our shipping organizations are able to secure; to restore the American merchant flag to trade; to place our ships in every port where there is business to be done—in other words, to stimulate foreign trade, is the plan of Washington.

"We shall want thousands of men for our Peace Fleets," said Mr. Hurley. "Our recruiting service, with twelve training ships, and bases at Boston, New York, Norfolk, New Orleans, San Francisco, Seattle and Cleveland, will keep right on preparing men for jobs under the American flag on merchant ships. This service is training at present 4,000 apprentices a month, and is planning to increase its

output. Recruits for the peace fleet will be accepted at any one of 6,800 drug store enrolling stations maintained by the Shipping Board."

The continuation of our Great Fleet program—the building of ten to twenty ships a month—and the vast shipping organization to stimulate trade in foreign countries, opens up international questions of great reach. Too, it opens the door to a new calling, to tens of thousands of American boys. It puts the American in every port of the world, his customs, his dollars, his business and banking interests. It makes for the freedom of the seas, and the closer ties of all nations.

Coincident with the continuance of the merchant marine program comes Secretary Daniels' announcement for an increasing naval program—a significant fact that reveals a future policy of American interests wherever trade and diplomacy may carry us.

The International Period of our growth is foreshadowed by the hand-in-hand policy of the two marine branches of the government. These plans involve vast expenditure of government treasure. They suggest vague possibilities of all sorts of international competition in waters where we have long been strangers. They open up trade rivalries in fields others have developed. They involve great vital questions bearing upon the inflation of wages. They take their fundamentals in government ownership and operation. They suggest rivalries in home shipping circles and coastal industries. They question the laws of supply and demand and have a bearing upon established laws of trade economics.

Our Great Peace Fleet projects our activities beyond our borders and describes to us a Sea Nation where our responsibilities will never cease.

A wonderful vision—will it pay dividends to Uncle Sam? We hope so.

Whence Came "Doughboy"

ENGLAND called him "Tommy Atkins"; Kipling did that. To Mother France he was the *Poilu,* for Papa Joffre loved the name. And in Russia when he swung past

with his great lumbering strides, he was "Ivan." All these lands had their pet name for him, so when we went to war a name we had to have, too. Some correspondent pinned "Sammy" on our boys and they groaned. Then they tried "Yanks," but "Looka here, sir, I'd like tuh state that"—so the army dropped "Yanks." And then, quite naturally, they took unto themselves a name; and the name is "Doughboy."

To be entirely precise, "Doughboys" are infantrymen. Artillery is artillery and an engineer is an engineer, but there's really only one picturesque term for our fighting men—"Doughboys." And the name "Doughboy," where does it come from? An old Non-Com with fifteen years' service put away in the Regulars declares that "Doughboy" comes from the old days, when for parade the infantry used to whiten the stripes of their blue trousers with flour. While a hoary Supply Sergeant avers that the infantry got the name because of the mud they churned up marching on soggy roads, likening it to the kneading of dough. While yet another Regular scornfully asserts that "Doughboy" came because on pay day the infantry always had plenty of money, whereas the artillery, docked for breakages to their costly *materiel,* would be "busted." But "Doughboy" it is. And the Doughboy will go down in history as the best fighting man in Europe.

Should the Right of Dower Be Abolished?

SINCE women have received the right to vote in the State of New York, the question of their privileges naturally arises. One of these, as ancient as the hills, is their Right of Dower; and the question may be now asked, should this Right of Dower be abolished in New York State?

Kent, in his justly celebrated commentaries, thus defines Dower: "The next species of life estates created by the act of the law," says he, "is that of Dower. It exists where a man is seized of an estate of inheritance, and dies in the lifetime of his wife. In that case she is at common law entitled to be endowed, for her natural life, of the third part of all the

lands whereof her husband was seized, either in deed or in law, at any time during the coverture, and of which any issue which she might have had, might by possibility have been heir."

It is to be observed that Dower is a right handed down to the women of the United States of America with the Common Law of England. It exists only where the husband is seized with an estate of inheritance. Consequently, in England, where the poor for many years could not hold land under a fee simple title, it was a privilege only of the rich and noble. In America, too, it more nearly affected the rich than the poor. Its value, in America, therefore, where the laws are for the masses, and not for the rich and titled few, as in England, is somewhat doubtful. For this, and the following reasons, it seems, therefore, to be fast losing its hold upon the American states.

Ten of the states in the Great American Union have abolished Dower. These states are Arizona, Idaho, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

The Right of Dower should be abolished, because it gives a woman an unequal hold upon a man's real property. In most of the states, by statute, a woman's property, whether real or personal, is at her own disposal. She may sell it whenever she pleases, whether her husband wishes it or not. On the other hand, a woman's Dower Rights prevents a man from disposing of his real property, unless the woman joins in the deed of sale, waiving all her rights of Dower. This, of course, under the theory that women shall have equal rights with men is, eminently unjust. Under the theory of equality, the wife should not have more right over the husband's property, than the husband has over the wife's property.

Dower should be abolished, because the law of Dower is very complicated, often tending to involve a decedent's estate in lengthy litigation, to the detriment of the heirs. "Dower," says Baird, "is barred (1) by release of the wife joining in a conveyance of the property with her husband; (2) by adultery of the wife, followed by divorce; (3) by

testamentary provision in lieu of Dower, which the wife accepts; (4) by any defeat of the husband's estate; (5) by eminent domain; (6) by judicial sale, foreclosure, etc., if allowed by statute, and (7) by jointure."

Dower should be abolished, because all the rights which it pretends to safeguard in the interest of a wife, can just as well be protected by a contract between the parties before marriage, without any of the disadvantages that attend the right of Dower, both to the wife and to the husband. The main object of Dower is to provide for the wife after the husband's demise, so that she may properly care for and educate the children born to her by the marriage. But these provisions can be better and more securely made in a contract between the parties before marriage. Such contracts between husband and wife were not possible under the old common law system. But in almost every state of the Union today the right of contract between husband and wife holds good after marriage as before it. Thus provisions may be made for the wife that cannot be defeated. It may be provided that she is to receive a certain sum of money, in case of an absolute divorce; that on the death of the husband, she shall receive a certain definite portion of his estate whether real or personal; and that proper provisions may be made for any and all contingencies.

Realize What the Animal Doctor Has Done

CONTAGIOUS and infectious animal diseases cause a loss to live stock interests at $200,000,000 annually. We produce annually about one and a half billion dozen eggs and it is estimated that about one-fifth of this is wasted and spoiled on the farms and on the way to the consumer. The food value of this waste is enormous. Again, our total annual production of creamery and dairy butter amounts to about 1,650,000,000 pounds, which releases about 33,046,000,000 pounds of skim milk and buttermilk and we find most of this valuable food is wasted. The food thus lost and wasted would be sufficient to feed the people of Belgium and Serbia for more than a year.

By authority of the United States Food Administration it is stated that since the war began there has been a world decrease in food animals of about 28 million cattle, 55 million sheep and 33 million hogs, and is continuing from day to day. The reduction of food animals involves not alone the supply of meat and dairy products, but also fats, wool, leather, and other by-products. For some time the European countries will necessarily be compelled to rely upon us to furnish them large quantities of animal products, and their depleted herds will have to be replenished as rapidly as possible. It is then our duty to produce food for a large part of the world.

The veterinarian in his role of animal economist plays an important part in this world drama. Whether in the army or civil life, he aids in the protection of the lives of men by guarding against the communicable diseases from animals to humans; he is the guide and adviser to the farmer, the breeder, and army remount staff, and above all he is the expert in the treatment of the sick and wounded of our dumb animals.

It is but too early to forget their indefatigable work in the recent outbreak of "Foot and Mouth Disease" and now completely they banished that scourge from our shores. They have pledged their services in the crusade for the elimination of tuberculosis from our dairy herds, and they are seriously engaged in the eradication of contagious abortion, anthrax, black-leg, scabies and Texas-fever from our cattle, the elimination of glanders, influenza and mange from our horses, the control and reduction of hog-cholera and swine-plague, and the extermination of pests and infestations among our sheep.

In the field of meat and milk hygiene, the veterinarian is doing his full duty in guarding against the possible release for consumption of unsound meat and dairy products. From the time the animal leaves the farm or ranch to the time the meat is ready for the home or mess kitchen it is under the watchful eye of the veterinary inspector. Up to date, of the millions of tons of meats and meat products sup-

plied to our armies, practically no complaint has been made against the inspection forces, nor have they found any putrid or decomposed meat which came from inspected establishments. What a significant comparison with the conditions that existed in the war of 1898. The Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, with its super-efficient organization, met the emergencies of war. And the Army Veterinary Corps, from a mere handful of men, was expanded to meet the unprecedented conditions, as a Division of our great Army Medical Department—the Veterinary Corps, here and across the sea. Their co-operation with the medical fraternity in the promotion of health and sanitation, and with the agricultural leaders in the development of a bigger and broader agriculture, that a safe and sufficient food supply may be assured the people, is the great work of the veterinarians, important to the health and welfare of the nation.

To THE FORUM'S Readers

IF your copy of the Magazine has arrived late (and we know it has), during the war period, and particularly the October issue, please bear with us, as delays due to paper shortage, and strikes, have been the common ills of all publishers.

During this strenuous period, THE FORUM has not "struck" for increased price, although many of the magazines have been obliged to ask for an advanced rate. Beginning with the January issue THE FORUM'S subscription price will be $3.00 a year. This is a slight advance and absolutely necessitated by the increased cost of labor and paper. We shall guarantee you increasing value in the measure of our service; in the character of our Table of Contents, and in size—as soon as war restrictions are abrogated and conditions become normal in the printing and publishing trades.

We shall take care of renewals at the present subscription price.